

**ROBERT M. GORRELL:
UNIVERSITY GROWING UP
RAMBLING REMINISCENCES OF AN ENGLISH PROFESSOR
AND ADMINISTRATOR, 1945-1980**

Interviewee: Robert M. Gorrell

Interviewed: 1981

Published: 1983

Interviewer: Kathryn M. Totton

UNOHP Catalog #100

Description

Robert Gorrell was born in 1914. He arrived at the University of Nevada, Reno, in 1944, as an experienced teacher of English, with an interesting and exciting career in his future. His previous teaching had been at Deep Springs, California, and at Indiana University. The president of the University of Nevada at that time was John O. Moseley.

Gorrell at once became active in the affairs of the English Department and of the university. The entire West was undergoing a population boom, which was reflected in the enrollment at the University of Nevada, very substantially in the Department of English. Along with some other faculty members who also arrived in the post-war rush, Gorrell was also widely recognized as a busy, productive, and sometimes controversial scholar. He and his contemporaries were destined to have important effects on programs and politics at the university.

Gorrell worked both on academic standards and on faculty rights. Very early, he served on a committee that succeeded in having faculty salaries raised. He was present when a controversy led to the dismissal of President Moseley; he was to witness similar incidents through the terms of seven more presidents or acting presidents. His most vivid and longest-lasting recollections had to do with the notorious administration of President Minard Stout. Gorrell had the distinction of being fired and reinstated by Stout, and then leading some of the activities that resulted in Stout's downfall.

Gorrell filled numerous administrative posts at the University of Nevada: chairman of the Department of English, dean of the Graduate School, dean of the College of Arts and Science, director of Extension, vice president for Academic Affairs, as well as holding many committee memberships and chairmanships. He was instrumental in the founding of the University of Nevada at Las Vegas. In each of these roles, his contacts with the university administration and the Board of Regents gave him unique insights into the institution's affairs. His memory of these activities proved clear, giving students of the university history an opportunity to supplement documentary research with this personal memoir.

**ROBERT M. GORRELL:
UNIVERSITY GROWING UP**

**ROBERT M. GORRELL:
UNIVERSITY GROWING UP
RAMBLING REMINISCENCES OF AN ENGLISH PROFESSOR
AND ADMINISTRATOR, 1945-1980**

An Oral History Conducted by Kathryn M. Totton

University of Nevada Oral History Program

Copyright 1983
University of Nevada Oral History Program
Mail Stop 0324
Reno, Nevada 89557
unohp@unr.edu
<http://www.unr.edu/oralhistory>

All rights reserved. Published 1983.
Printed in the United States of America

Publication Staff:
Director: R.T. King

University of Nevada Oral History Program Use Policy

All UNOHP interviews are copyrighted materials. They may be downloaded and/or printed for personal reference and educational use, but not republished or sold. Under “fair use” standards, excerpts of up to 1000 words may be quoted for publication without UNOHP permission as long as the use is non-commercial and materials are properly cited. The citation should include the title of the work, the name of the person or people interviewed, the date of publication or production, and the fact that the work was published or produced by the University of Nevada Oral History Program (and collaborating institutions, when applicable). Requests for permission to quote for other publication, or to use any photos found within the transcripts, should be addressed to the UNOHP, Mail Stop 0324, University of Nevada, Reno, Reno, NV 89557-0324. Original recordings of most UNOHP interviews are available for research purposes upon request.

CONTENTS

Preface to the Digital Edition	ix
Introduction	xi
1. Introduction to Nevada	1
2. Early Years in the English Department	11
3. The Minard Stout Administration	19
4. The University in the 1960s	49
5. The 1970s	79
6. University Administration and Administrators	95
7. Thoughts on the Role of the University	155
8. Concluding Thoughts	173
Original Index: For Reference Only	183

PREFACE TO THE DIGITAL EDITION

Established in 1964, the University of Nevada Oral History Program (UNOHP) explores the remembered past through rigorous oral history interviewing, creating a record for present and future researchers. The program's collection of primary source oral histories is an important body of information about significant events, people, places, and activities in twentieth and twenty-first century Nevada and the West.

The UNOHP wishes to make the information in its oral histories accessible to a broad range of patrons. To achieve this goal, its transcripts must speak with an intelligible voice. However, no type font contains symbols for physical gestures and vocal modulations which are integral parts of verbal communication. When human speech is represented in print, stripped of these signals, the result can be a morass of seemingly tangled syntax and incomplete sentences—totally verbatim transcripts sometimes verge on incoherence. Therefore, this transcript has been lightly edited.

While taking great pains not to alter meaning in any way, the editor may have removed false starts, redundancies, and the “uhs,” “ahs,” and other noises with which speech is often liberally sprinkled; compressed some passages which, in unaltered form, misrepresent the chronicler's meaning; and relocated some material to place information in its intended context. Laughter is represented with [laughter] at the end of a sentence in which it occurs, and ellipses are used to indicate that a statement has been interrupted or is incomplete...or that there is a pause for dramatic effect.

As with all of our oral histories, while we can vouch for the authenticity of the interviews in the UNOHP collection, we advise readers to keep in mind that these are remembered pasts, and we do not claim that the recollections are entirely free of error. We can state, however, that the transcripts accurately reflect the oral history recordings on which they were based. Accordingly, each transcript should be approached with the

same prudence that the intelligent reader exercises when consulting government records, newspaper accounts, diaries, and other sources of historical information. All statements made here constitute the remembrance or opinions of the individuals who were interviewed, and not the opinions of the UNOHP.

In order to standardize the design of all UNOHP transcripts for the online database, most have been reformatted, a process that was completed in 2012. This document may therefore differ in appearance and pagination from earlier printed versions. Rather than compile entirely new indexes for each volume, the UNOHP has made each transcript fully searchable electronically. If a previous version of this volume existed, its original index has been appended to this document for reference only. A link to the entire catalog can be found online at <http://oralhistory.unr.edu/>.

For more information on the UNOHP or any of its publications, please contact the University of Nevada Oral History Program at Mail Stop 0324, University of Nevada, Reno, NV, 89557-0324 or by calling 775/784-6932.

Alicia Barber
Director, UNOHP
July 2012

INTRODUCTION

Robert Gorrell arrived at the University of Nevada in 1944, an experienced teacher of English, with an interesting and even exciting career in his future. His previous teaching had been at Deep Springs, California and at Indiana University. The president of the University of Nevada at that time was John O. Moseley.

Gorrell at once became active in the affairs of the English department and of the University. The entire West was undergoing a population boom, which was reflected in the enrollments at the University of Nevada, very substantially in the department of English. Along with some other faculty members who also arrived in the post-war rush, Gorrell was also widely recognized as a busy, productive, and sometimes controversial scholar. He and his contemporaries were destined to have important effects on programs and politics at the University.

Gorrell worked both on academic standards and on faculty rights. Very early, he served on a committee that succeeded in having faculty salaries raised. He was present

when a controversy led to the dismissal of President Moseley; he was to witness similar incidents through the terms of seven more presidents or acting presidents. His most vivid and longest-lasting recollections had to do with the notorious administration of President Minard Stout. Gorrell had the distinction of being fired and reinstated by Stout, and then leading in some of the activities that resulted in Stout's downfall.

Gorrell filled numerous administrative posts at the University of Nevada: chairman of the department of English, Dean of the Graduate School, Dean of Arts and Science, Director of Extension, Vice President for Academic Affairs, as well as holding many committee memberships and chairmanships. He was instrumental in the founding of the University of Nevada at Las Vegas. In each of these roles, his contacts with the University administration and the Board of Regents gave him unique insights into the institution's affairs.. Fortunately, his memory of these activities proved clear, giving students of the University history an opportunity to

supplement documentary research with this personal memoir.

When invited to contribute a University Memoir, Dr. Gorrell accepted readily. He was an articulate, cooperative, well-informed chronicler of his University of Nevada career through twelve taping sessions, all in the Oral History office between July, 1980 and March, 1981. Dr. Gorrell's review of his memoir resulted in only a few changes to clarify wording or correct facts; the language remains intact.

The Oral History Program of the University of Nevada Reno Library conducts interviews for the history of the institution with prominent or long-time professors or administrators. Resulting transcripts are deposited in the University Archives at the Reno campus. Robert Gorrell has generously donated the literary rights in his memoir to the University of Nevada and has designated the volume as open for research.

Kathryn N. Totton
University of Nevada-Reno
1983

INTRODUCTION TO NEVADA

Well, starting at Nevada, I did my college at Indiana University and Cornell, and finished my Ph.D. at Cornell in 1939. And then I'd been teaching at a little experimental college called Deep Springs, down east of Big Pine in the desert; it's a small experimental school that had been endowed and [is] still in operation, and I'm still interested in it. But I left there in 1941 and went back to Indiana University, where I taught for three years, starting an army program. While I was there, I had as my office mate Dick Lillard, who did a book called *Desert Challenge*. And Dick and I talked some about Nevada, although I'd never been in Nevada even when I was at Deep Springs. No, that isn't right. I'd driven through Reno, I guess, once, and I'd driven to Las Vegas often; that was the train station for Deep Springs, so we'd drive down there to pick up visitors once in a while. There must've been fifteen thousand people in Vegas at the time, and dirt streets, and so on.

And while I was in Indiana with Lillard as my roommate, I got a call one night from a friend of mine there, Harold O.

"Fritzie" Whitehall, who was a linguist in the English department at Indiana. Well, his wife called one night and said, "Well, Larry's in town. Aren't you coming over?"

And I said, "Who's Larry?"

And, "Well, didn't Fritzie tell you? You were supposed to come over and meet him tonight. He's here from University of Nevada, and he's looking for staff."

And so I did go over and met Chariton Laird, who had come to Indiana to interview Lillard, who was an applicant for a position at Nevada.. And in the meantime, the president had hired a friend of his in American literature, which is what Lillard taught; and then Nevada did not need two people in American literature, so Laird did come around to the office and talked to me, and did need somebody in Renaissance literature. And we ended up that evening with him offering me a job at Nevada, which seemed a long way off. And we decided this was an obvious lark; we had been at Deep Springs, but except for that, we never had any experience in the wild, woolly West, and we thought it

might be fun for a year to see what life was like in other places, and came out and remained. And it was purely a kind of adventure notion. I had no notion what the University of Nevada was like. It had been described to me as a small Rocky Mountain University.

We got here, and it was a small Rocky Mountain university! The English department that year consisted of Laird and me, and Laird had come back after a year's postdoctoral fellowship at Yale, and I came out new, and the person whom the president had hired was Paul Eldridge from the university of Oklahoma, who was also in American literature. During those years (I can't remember which) there were also a couple of people who came back part-time after the war and taught, I think, part-time, usually. One of them was a man named Paul Harwood, who didn't stay very long, who had been here earlier; and another was Ray Butterworth, who was here, and he went off to UCLA eventually to work on his Ph.D. And he didn't return after that; he did do his Ph.D. at UCLA eventually.

The university was an interesting place, and the English department consisted of the three of us at that time, and we suddenly were inundated with students. The postwar rush of students came, and the enrollment took a tremendous rise to something like eight or nine hundred students. And that is not a very large university, but it did make a good deal of difference in the English department because all of the new students were taking English, and we ended up sort of going out in the street and tapping people on the shoulder: "Do you speak English?" "How would you like to teach for a small sum?" [chuckling] And we did end up with a lot of faculty wives teaching one course at slave wages, and a lot of people who hadn't taught before but who did have bachelor's degrees in English or something. And all of us taught a good deal ourselves.

My wife taught two sections, and during the semester our daughter, who was then about six months, fell out of bed and broke her femur, so I ended up teaching most of those extra two sections [laughing], while she took care of the baby with the broken leg.

And we did manage to get through two or three years on that basis, doing it intentionally. That is, we did not want to rush into hiring staff without a chance to select them, so we did put on people temporarily, and wait until we could build the department more systematically when we had time to, in order to meet that sudden rush of enrollment.

The University, generally, was something of a shock, actually, after coming from Indiana and Cornell. I remember the first faculty meeting which occurred, I think the first week I was here, and it turned out to be a kind of omen of things to come. The faculty was assembled, and the sort of special speaker for the occasion was introduced, and it was Silas E. Ross who was introduced as chairman of the Board of Regents. And I guess the first surprise was that a local undertaker was the chairman of the Board of Regents, although it turned out he had also been on the faculty of the University another time. He started the meeting with a very grim face, a speech saying that he had heard rumors that some members of the faculty had made critical remarks about the way the institution ran, and had been downtown making observations to townspeople that were not totally complimentary to the University, that that was a practice that had to stop, and members of the faculty were to stick to their classes and do nothing else, and that was it. And I, along with a few others—relatively few, really, I gathered—discovered that that was maybe not a total surprise, and I was about to go back someplace [laughing]. It was a kind

of rude introduction to the kind of faculty attitude at the time.

No it wasn't personal, but it is true that for the most part at that time, the faculty were pretty much hired to teach large loads, did not get much interested in research. And the attitude generally was that what one was supposed to do was teach and stick to his business and not be doing any writing or any research at all. I remember a legislator getting very much excited and having articles in the newspaper because Ed Lowrance in the department of biology had published a couple of quite widely used, as I recall, articles on the bone structure of the muskrat. And the legislator made great waves in the newspapers. "What's this? What are they doing wasting their time on those muskrats who aren't good for much anyway?" And that was not an unusual attitude at the time. Things changed fairly rapidly, but they needed to change, I think.

And there were about that time, a number of people who did come in, all of us about the same age, who did come in from larger institutions with different ideas about the University, about the faculty, and a kind of considerable change did develop about that time. In the English department, Laird and I and Eldridge were all new, and we did rather quickly bring in some other people. Maurice Beesley in mathematics was interested in research; there were three or four biologists—Dwight Billings and Frank Richardson and Lowrance, whom I mentioned, although he left soon after that. [Christian W. F.] Fritz Melz in foreign languages was a scholar with a good background and a good deal of interest in developing things. So there was a nucleus of a kind of "new faculty."

As I remember, Jim Hulse in his book talks about a kind of change in the faculty that occurred about that time, as the faculty

started developing. And with the postwar enrollment increases, we were adding faculty all the time, and the faculty did increase pretty rapidly.

One of the kinds of things that developed fairly quickly with the faculty in those days was a growing faculty awareness of the faculty as a growing force, as a power. And I suppose it was that change that ultimately led to the Stout business in the early 1950s.

But one of the things that did happen soon after I got there, was a considerable increase in faculty involvement or at least faculty pressures for more involvement in the way the University was going. The two groups that did have some influence—well, three groups, really—there were official groups on the campus that had been instituted under the presidency of Charlie Gorman, I think. And Gorman was president before I came (he had been acting president for a year), although he was comptroller when I got there. And Gorman had much interest in developing some faculty influence, and had allowed the faculty to develop what was the elected faculty committee which could, according to the regents charter, appeal directly to the Board of Regents if it needed to, over the president's head. Rather an unusual kind of thing. That was one group that was just developing when I came. Another was the Administrative Council, which had two elected faculty members; the rest of it was administrators.

And then there was also the AAUP, which had a good deal of backing and enthusiasm among the faculty. But when I came, I remember that AAUP met around in faculty members' houses and got served tea and cookies, and had little talks of a very harmless nature, and it was a pleasant social group. About the time I came, however, one of the first AAUP meetings I went to heard a report from a professor of education, Edith

Ruebsam. And Edith made a report on the need for sabbatical leaves at the University of Nevada. It was a very good report, very carefully worked out. And the AAUP, with a good deal of shaking and quaking and fear, voted to endorse it and sent it to the administration, and the next thing we knew, the sabbatical leaves had been established. And they were not only established, they were established in a very favorable way with a two-thirds salary for a full-year sabbatical, which is a good deal more generous than most sabbatical programs are. Now we did run into trouble with the legislature so that there's a quota on the number that can be provided, and we've since had all sorts of trouble because we haven't been able to fund any replacement for the sabbatical. So a sabbatical leave has to come out of the hide of the rest of the faculty one way or another [chuckling], but still it was done.

And then the next thing that happened is I found myself chairman of a salary committee which was a totally new thing—the AAUP salary committee. And we worked very hard and produced an extensive report with comparative salaries, charts showing how we fared in relation to garbage collectors and plumbers, and also of course the salaries in other institutions. And that report was completed, sent to the administration after a stormy battle in the AMP, in which the general advice was, “Oh, you can't do this; you're going to be in all sorts of trouble if you suggest this. That isn't the way the Board of Regents or the legislature behaves. In This state you can't ask for things—you're in real trouble.” But we did get a majority in the AAUP and ultimately in the faculty, and it did go on to the board, and we got, as I remember, it was something like a nine-hundred-dollar increase that year.

Not that that gave anybody an extravagant salary; I think—I can't be sure now, but

this is close—I came out here to get a two-hundred-dollar raise, and I think that got my salary to eighteen hundred a year, which in many ways wasn't bad. We didn't have a car or anything like that, but we had a house and we ate fairly well, and we saved a little money, even had a baby during the year. So it wasn't as far off. But the top salary, as I recall, for a full professor, the top salary was around three thousand dollars, and that was way, way below salaries in other institutions, so that getting the increases didn't really get us very far ahead.

But the point of all this is one of the things that was happening in those early days was that the faculty was beginning to feel some self identification, some power, if you like, and beginning to make itself felt. Another manifestation that's even more (and I'm probably getting out of sequence now) was that the faculty did have a role two or three years later in influencing the legislature.

A couple of things occurred during those years. One of them was that, somewhere fairly early, I think it must have been in the first three or four years after I was here, we did get this salary increase recommended through AAUP. And I was then president of AAUP (I can't remember which years, but maybe '48, '49, along there) and did discover that the president, who was John Moseley, had agreed to our proposal, and had agreed to take it to the education committee and the money committees in the legislature. And we got a copy—I've never been sure where this came from, but somehow or other we got a copy of the letter that Charlie Gorman, who had been acting president (and who was then comptroller and who was very well known in the state and very well liked in Carson City)—a letter that Charlie Gorman had written to some legislators saying, in effect, that we didn't really need

these salary increases at the present. This was in considerable measure the result of an infight between Gorman, the comptroller, and Moseley, the president, although I guess we weren't entirely sure of all that was going on.

But I did get the copy of this letter and called an open meeting of AAUP, which was attended by most of the faculty, and we wrote some resolutions again with much scurrying and much fear and much conspiratorial undercover stuff. Dean of Arts and Science, Fred Wood, was in on this, and I remember we locked up the rough papers from the drafts in his safe in the Arts and Science office [laughing], and sent the protest letter off to the education committee which was coming to the University for a hearing. And then we elected four representatives of the faculty to appear before the education committee and make the case on the basis of the protest that we had sent on the salary.

And I remember a good deal of the dramatics of the affair; I can't remember who—I think the four of us who were representing the faculty were Maurice Beesley in mathematics, and Fritz Melz, I believe Dwight Billings in biology, and I think those were the four of us—I can't be sure now. But we did make this case in the education committee, and Gorman (the comptroller) and the president were both there. And Gorman began protesting vigorously that he was being accused of things he hadn't done, and I remember distinctly being able to reach in my pocket and dramatically pull out the copy of the letter and I handed it (to) the chairman of the education committee. And at that stage, they threw Gorman out of the meeting, and then Moseley, the president, apparently showed so much satisfaction at Gorman's being thrown out that they threw him out (laughs) also And we did, ultimately, I think, get most of the salary increase at the

time. And both Moseley and Gorman were fired soon after that; Gorman retired, and Moseley was—well, he resigned, but he was fired. And I don't know what year that was.

Kathryn M. Totton: I think '49.

Probably that's right.

Jim Hulse mentioned that Gorman was, with some politicking, jockeying with that, retired with a full year's pay.

Yes, that's right. And Moseley, I think, was fired with a full year's pay, something like that. And Moseley, well, Moseley's now dead, I'm sure. He was an Oklahoman, a Rhodes scholar, a kind of interesting fellow—I always liked Moseley pretty well.

The students called him the Laughing Boy and Jingling John. And he was not the picture, I guess, of a dignified, learned, college-president man by any means; he didn't have very extensive respect, but he did have some genuine interests in building education. Not a lot of experience—there were some strange episodes, from which the faculty developed some considerable lack of respect.

I remember a speech that he gave somewhere in California. And then—and in a way this is typical of the kind of naiveté that did cause him trouble in the end—he delivered this speech and then distributed copies to the faculty. And the title of the speech, of which he was very proud, was "Jesus Christ, the Boy Scout," or "God Give Us Passionate Men." And [laughing], it was an almost incredibly silly performance, you know, for a sophisticated—allegedly sophisticated—college president, and it did manage to get him not very much respect, I think. But he was dropped and I guess [Gilbert E.] Parker must have succeeded him. Is that right? Yes. Well, I might as well

remember some things from that period, too, because they were similar.

But anyway, Parker was president for just a year. And he got off to a very bad start. Parker was a very nice fellow; he'd been a chairman of the ROTC department, and he was a colonel. And of course, his appointment was an absurdity; he had no qualifications to be acting president at all, but the Board of Regents had this strange notion that what was needed was more discipline on the faculty.

Silas Ross was pretty much running the University single-handed, as far as the board went. And he did, I think, continue the sort of feud that he'd expressed in my first faculty meeting—that what was needed around here was a firmer hand on the faculty so that they were not out expressing themselves and being active in politics and so on. And Parker started his regime with an ultimatum that went out all over the campus, which in effect said that, although faculty members were exempt from the provisions of the Hatch Act, that we, nevertheless, in the University were to restrict our political activities. And it went on: we were allowed to march in political parades only if we carried a musical instrument. He picked it all out of the Hatch Act restrictions on political activity for government employees.

I think he did this in perfectly good faith, naively thinking that the Hatch Act was supposed to apply to University faculty. The last sentence of a letter, I remember, said that this was not to infringe our rights to vote in general elections, and—. [Laughing]

But anyway, that immediately created a furor around, and again, I guess I was president of AAUP. That was one of the dodges we used: we didn't have faculty meetings very often, but as president of AAUP, I could call a faculty meeting and invite all of the faculty, and we were small

enough that almost all the faculty would show up. So we had another AAUP meeting, and as I remember, all but one of the faculty appeared at that AAUP meeting.

And it was a very emotional meeting, in which people made speeches about freedom of speech and political rights and franchise and voting rights and all that. And we ended with a resolution condemning Parker's actions, and it was passed with only one abstention. And the abstention was Biggie—Al Higginbotham in the journalism department—and Biggie just didn't want to commit himself on anything. He was a great abstainer on votes. He had been the one who was terribly worried about that AAUP report also, I know. I remember he didn't want to do anything that might rock any boats. But except for that, it was a unanimous thing.

And then a meeting of the Administrative Council was called, and there were two faculty representatives on the Administrative Council; the rest were the deans and directors and so on. And the other faculty member was Fred Traner, who was dean of the College of Education, and a very fine man. And I remember Traner was a very conservative person, generally, but very sincere and a man of integrity. And I remember he and I walked up together, and he was shaking just like this, and he kept [voice shaking, stuttering] "I...I hope I don't say...I hope I don't say what I really feel!" And then he would shake some more.

You know, he had this long tradition of doing what he was supposed to do; he was not given to rocking any boats or showing and dissension. The rest of us, the Young Turks who were out there, we didn't have any concerns about shooting our mouths off at all. But Fred Traner was terribly upset, and we got into the meeting, and we hadn't been there twenty seconds until Traner was

on his feet [laughs] and made a very calm, direct, very good speech. And it didn't take any more speeches; the president just backed down like that, and we did it. But Parker never quite recovered any faculty respect after that, I suppose.

[Laughing] There was another funny incident that year, I remember. Alessandro Dandini was teaching foreign languages, and well, he's still marshal of the University. And I was secretary of this Faculty Welfare Committee or Faculty Grievance Committee, whatever it was—the elected committee that was supposed to handle difficulties and which did very successfully handle most of the difficulties that came up. The University was still small enough that we could talk with any faculty who had problems. But we finally got this one thrown in our lap: it turned out that Dandini had collected something like forty-seven parking tickets, and was not about to pay them. He was a very rich man, so it wasn't a question of money; this was a matter of principle. And [chuckling] he was not gonna pay 'em, but Colonel Parker insisted he was gonna pay 'em. And so when Sandro discovered that Colonel Parker insisted he was gonna pay 'em, he started out with various campaigns.

One thing, he went around with his camera and took pictures of all the illegally parked cars in the faculty spots as evidence that he was being discriminated against because others were—and he probably was—that is, the police were watching out for his car. (Sandro drove a 1940 Buick, which he had had at least three new motors in, which he would not give up because no other car manufacturer made a hardtop convertible, and that's what this was and what he wanted, so he kept rebuilding it year after year. He sold it only two or three years ago to a collector in Iowa who pleased him.) But anyway, it was an easily-distinguished car, and I think the

police were laying for it and did give him a ticket every time he came.

But he was convinced that they were doing it and that the president was behind it. So at that time, the president had an individually marked spot in front of Morrill Hall, and so Sandro took to parking in the president's spot whenever he couldn't find another one [laughing], and he would then get a ticket! And he would then go to the president, and he was not going to pay them; he would resign first; he would sue the president—.

And we spent hours that semester, I remember, in the committee trying to resolve this [laughs]—this difficulty with Parker and Dandini arguing over the parking stickers. And I can't remember how we ever solved it! Somehow or other, we did get a compromise, and Dandini stayed on the staff and he did not pay all his parking tickets, so that we managed to work out something to save everybody's face. And I can't remember what we did, but it was a kind of triumph of committee-style ombudsmanship, and was again an example of what went on there.

Was there resistance from older faculty members to this increasing faculty awareness and involvement?

Not really a lot. There was a certain amount of apathy, but on the whole, the older members of the faculty—oh, not all of them, but on the whole—the older members of the faculty weren't very active but they didn't resist. And in many instances, they participated and were very—they just needed some allies, you know; they'd been so long without it. And when they had help, they did it.

For example, well, Traner was one who was near retirement as dean of Education, and he was very active in AAUP and in other—. George Sears, who was chairman of

chemistry, and George Sears, who was older, was very active and very helpful. And who were some of the older faculty members? The history faculty—there were two or three older ones there, and they were not particularly interested. Charlie Hicks, who was the chairman, was very conservative in all his views, but he didn't object to what was going on, but he didn't participate much, as Higginbotham didn't.

Leifson in physics was generally active in things. And particularly Leifson was very vigorous in pushing for research support and for additional research and scholarly activity in the faculty. He was very much interested there when things got going.

But on the whole, it didn't develop a lot of resistance and it was a general move. That is, as new faculty members came in, there was something nearer in atmosphere like a real university. And it wasn't universal by any means, but were some departments that were developing a good deal more, the scholarly reputation and the more scholarly activity.

Let's see, Malcolm Love succeeded Parker, didn't he?

Yes.

It's funny, I don't remember much that happened while Love was there. He was a pleasant, friendly person there for a long time, very much admired, as I recall. He couldn't have been here very long.

Two years, I think.

Two years seems right. And I just can't remember much excitement that occurred while Love was here. As far as I can tell, generally he was well liked and didn't produce any grave antagonisms, but didn't get a great deal accomplished.

I think Jim Hulse labeled those years as an era of good feelings.

Yes, it was pretty much. His daughter was a student in English, and I can't remember her name now. It was generally a fairly calm time. There was some growth, and it was reflected in what he did. Now I suppose he left about the time Stout arrived on campus. Yeah, Stout must have succeeded him.

We talked about the firing of Moseley and Gorman in those years. Who was behind that?

Well, it was a combination of things. There was a split on the board. [Silas] Ross had some opposition on the board from Albert Hilliard, who was a local attorney who was on the board for several years, and who was much more likely to be on the faculty side of things so that there was a split between Ross and Hilliard, at least with the other board members not particularly active. And what happened is that after the education meeting—the meeting of the committee on education in the legislature, there was enough concern in the faculty and in the board also about either Gorman or about Moseley, that the result was that those who were supporting Gorman tended to be anti-Moseley, and the people who were supporting Moseley tended to be anti-Gorman, and between them it just ended up so that the board was opposed enough to both of them that [laughing] with Gorman retiring, the thing that seemed to need to happen was that Moseley go, too. And that was sort of the way it went. There was faculty opposition, too, but it was mostly political pushing and only on the board, I think. He was given a year's notice—that kind of thing—or maybe—no, I guess he was given a year's salary, maybe something like that (I forget).

At least according to Hulse's book, Gorman was given a year's leave with pay.

Yeah. I think Moseley was, too; I think maybe it was a last-minute—they had fired Moseley, asked for his resignation, and I think it was a kind of afterthought, that since they had given Gorman the year's leave with pay, they did the same for Moseley. That's my recollection of what happened.

What was the campus reaction to this whole thing? You say there was some opposition.

Oh, in general the campus approved that maneuver. Well, the campus was considerably upset over Gorman's not backing the president's budget requests. But it was not—the campus was not particularly likely to support Moseley either, so there wasn't really much unfavorable reaction to his being dropped. And he took another job as—I think was a national organizer for SAB fraternity.

One of the curious things in those days was the extent to which the Masonic lodge and the SAE fraternity were running the institution. The year before I came, which would have been 1944, I suppose—sometime during the year—I got this only by hearsay, but I got it from Fred Wood, who was dean of Arts and Science—according to Fred Wood, that year, all deans, plus William Miller in the speech department, were invited as full-grown men to join SAE. With the exception of Fred Wood, the deans did apparently pay their hundred bucks and get initiated into the mysteries of the Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity, which was the fraternity of Silas Ross, chairman of the board, and of John O. Moseley, president of the University. And I think of this because when Moseley left here, he became a national paid organizer for SAB, which he had joined as an adult, and I suppose he had all the zeal of a convert for that reason.

But according to Wood, all the other deans joined, and Wood did not behave courageously and say no; he left town for a week [Laughs] But he didn't do it. The only ones I specifically remember who did were Robert Griffin, who was dean of men at the time, later went back to be chairman of the speech department; and William Miller in speech—Bill Miller, who's still around (well, Griffin's still around, too); and Cecil Creel, who was dean of Agriculture and who's dead now, I think, and I believe whoever was dean of Engineering did, too (I'm not sure who it was, whether it was Stanley Palmer or—I can't remember).

But there was this strong connection between SAE fraternity and administration and Masonic lodge. And whether there was any—well, there was pressure, certainly, to do the SAE thing. Whether there was any pressure towards membership in the Masonic lodge or not, I'm not sure, but Ross was the highest of the high mucky-mucks in Nevada in the Masonic lodge. And either by design or accident, almost all administrators in the University were members of Masonic lodge and fairly active.

And that trend continued, oh, quite a while—not, I think, in recent years with any kind of pressure, but still a lot of the administrators in the University were high in the Masonic order. Ed Pine, for example, who just retired as vice president for business and who never used—there's not the slightest indication, I think, that Ed ever used this for any kind of influence in the University, but he was the successor to Si Ross as the major figure in Masonry in the state. And Ralph Irwin, who up until seven or eight years ago, was academic or administrative vice president—maybe it was academic vice president—but he got his job and was also influential in the Masonic lodge at the time.

He became dean of Arts and Science after Stout left, and a lot of people accused Ross and the board of appointing him in order to keep the Masonic regime going. I think it had nothing to do with it, but there was a lot of talk of that sort.

Was there any evidence in the way the campus was run of this?

Oh, no, I don't think so. And there was nothing vicious about it either; it was kind of part of the whole "old boy" syndrome that ran the state at the time. The state was run politically in much the same way. It was a group that went back to Pat McCarran's senate group, and a couple of the political leaders were Norman Biltz and John Mueller, who had a great deal of political control. Si Ross had the educational branch of the group, Joe McDonald, the newspaper. They'd all been University of Nevada buddies and fraternity brothers, and they simply, for what they considered at least the most benevolent of motives, sort of parceled out the control. And I'm exaggerating, obviously, but there was really that kind of fairly close-knit, strong political group in the state, and who'd extended into the University to a considerable degree. There was quite a lot of that.

But was it possible for someone who was not, say, a Mason or member of the SAE to move into higher administrative positions?

Well, I don't know. Almost nobody did in those early days, and it's hard to know whether it was possible. But on the other hand, there wasn't much movement of that sort. Fred Wood, who was dean of Arts and Science, was an exception. He was a mathematician who had come out from the Middle West and who made no pretense to being an SAB. I don't

know whether he was a Mason or not, but he certainly was not an enthusiastic Mason or particularly strong one. And I can't think of any other administrative appointment that was made during those days; there wasn't that much turnover in the deanships.

There was one fairly early appointment when Dean [Fred] Tranter retired as dean of Education. Harold Brown was made dean of Education, and he was a Catholic, so he was obviously not a Mason (he wasn't a very good Catholic, but—) . And he was dean when Stout came and was dropped from the deanship because he didn't play the same right.

No, I don't think of other administrative appointments that were made in those days, except department chairmen, and there wasn't much concern about the—they were not regarded as important enough, I suppose! [Laughs]

EARLY YEARS IN THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

The department, as I told you, was very small when we came out here. And it did have to expand largely to teach the freshman English. Charlton Laird was chairman the first year I was here, but the second year he had been trying to get rid of any administration as rapidly as he could—and the second year I was here, I did—I can't remember whether I was acting chairman or chairman immediately—(not a lot of difference) and about 1946 I did start being chairman of the department.

And during those early years we did have a long string of relatively temporary people and a whole series of different kinds of problems with them. Maybe I shouldn't memorialize them by name; I'm not sure I can remember the names. But we did have one woman who was hired by President Moseley. Moseley had a habit of hiring people, of making loud noises about the importance of faculty participation in hiring, how things should be done by the department, and then announcing that he had hired somebody on your staff. And these, of course, I protested vigorously, but after

somebody was contracted, it didn't really matter whether [laughing] you protested!

Well, anyway, he had hired a woman; she had been teaching high school in Brooklyn, and Moseley hired her apparently because he thought ultimately she would—she had done some counseling, and he thought she was gonna be a real candidate for a dean of women, ultimately. But in the meantime, he hired her to teach English.

And she was a very nice, very pleasant woman, and a reasonably good teacher, except that it wasn't long before I got clear indications that there were some real problems with the woman. First I started getting strange reports from the students about what went on in her classes— sort of irrelevant, wild talk of different sorts. And then she came in to see me a couple of times; she had been living with the dean of women. And she came in to give me reports about how the dean of women was leading the plot to get her, that the plot was there, and they were after her all the time. And then a little later it got to be the dean

of women wouldn't stop the airplanes, and they were coming in airplanes after her, and the thing kept happening night after night. And so I'd get these stories from her. Well, I went to the president, and said, "Look, this woman's sick. We've got to get her out of the classroom—"

And he would not listen to any of it because all he said was, "Well, you protested her coming out—I know you're just trying—you're workin' against her; you're trying to get rid of her; you're not being fair to her. The only reason you're doing this is that I hired her, and then you're trying to sabotage her work. And we're not gonna listen to any of this gossip and this wild talk."

Well, I finally made one of my most successful administrative strokes at about this time. She had taken to calling me at various times to stop the airplanes. The focus of the paranoia was apparently on airplanes, in which the agents were going to either drop bombs or just come and kidnap her, I couldn't be sure. And she wasn't this way all the time, but she'd get these streaks, and they tended to occur about four or five in the morning. And so I [chuckles]—I'd gotten one or two of these calls, and then I finally got one about four o'clock one Sunday morning. I had a stroke of genius, and I did say, "Well, Marianne, I can't stop the airplanes, but if you will call Dr. Moseley immediately, I know he can stop the airplanes! You just call him at once."

And she called him, and she was on an airplane back to her [laughing] family in New York the next day! It was a successful administrative coup. And we did have some real problems; you know, as I told you, we were intentionally trying not to appoint permanent staff, and by relying on temporary people, we did have some who were in some ways a little strange. And I got broken into the administration fairly quickly there.

Another one was a young fellow who was one of the best jazz piano players I have ever heard; he was really wonderful. He was not a very good English teacher, although he had nearly completed a degree at USC, as I remember, but he was not a very good English teacher, but he was a wonderful jazz piano player. But he also had a kind of curious evangelical religious streak, and he also was terribly jealous of his wife. And he got a notion that his wife was having some kind of affair with another person in the English department. And we finally got him talked out of that one.

But along sometime later, I got a call (again, I think it was four in the morning) from the wife. And she got on the phone. "He's got a gun! He's got a gun! You gotta come over!"

And I guess without much thinking, I got dressed and went over, which was utterly stupid! And here [chuckling]—here he was; he did have a gun, but he also had some phony preacher he'd picked up down there, and the preacher was there on his knees [laughing]—and why he was there with a gun! And Pat was her name, and she was sitting there and being not receptive at all of the fact that she was being prayed for, and being brought back into line. And I wasn't sure what he was going to do with the gun. I did talk him out of the gun, and I don't know what I did with the gun. I'm scared of guns! I wouldn't—I never shot a pistol in my life, I guess. And [chuckles] I talked him out of it and I got the preacher out of the place. They weren't drunk, the preacher may have been high on drugs, I don't know. But they calmed down. And I guess when he got fired at the end of the year, they were still married—I don't know—but she must have had a miserable existence, and it was there.

We had another one who had phoned in her credentials. We'd hired her because she

had a very good A.B. from a good eastern college, and she looked fine and had a background in Latin and all this, and spoke well, looked as if she could teach freshman English very well.

And she did; she was quite a good teacher, but she also had a strange streak, and she had told us at the time, although it didn't much concern us, that she had a master's degree in bacteriology and a doctor's degree in bacteriology, one from Yale and one from Johns Hopkins, as I remember. And we thought this was nice, but it isn't what we were looking for, for someone as a temporary teacher of freshman English.

Well, it turned out that she was much interested in these two degrees and kept making a point of it, and being called "Doctor." And she'd never turned in any transcripts for those, saying they were lost overseas and during the war or something, that she'd been shipping things—transcripts were lost. And we didn't pay much attention to it largely because we didn't care whether she had the degrees anyway. But some other people on the faculty did get concerned about them, and did check up, and it turned out that the degrees were totally fabrications. And also we got to checking back with people she'd talked to, and apparently she had been really working very hard to keeping these degrees plausible. She would read the science sections of *Time* magazine, and finally people discovered, then, she made a great show of scientific talk between classes and in the lounge with people. And finally somebody kept watching these and kept reading the *Time* science sections and discovered what she was doing was reading *Time* magazine each week and then incorporating this in her conversation as a way of justifying these two degrees, which didn't matter. She did really get sick, though, about the time she left. And she

ended in a hospital in Utah or Idaho, I think, and was really mentally ill.

So life in the English department was not calm in those days, although we were building quite a good department. We were getting young people with Ph.D.'s, whereas most departments didn't have a high of complement Ph.D.'s, we were able to get Ph.D.'s in English. Stu Daley had a Yale Ph.D. as I remember; and John Morrison came down from Washington—got his degree in Washington.

Then we had some other "all-but-dissertation" people that stayed two or three years but were well trained. [Lawrence E.] Laurie Mascott is one I remember from those days, and he's now writing television scripts in Hollywood. He's done three or four very successful documentary films. He and his wife, Tina, were here. He'd been fairly badly injured during the war, and he had a reasonably large pension as a result. He was a good teacher and a bright person.

And his wife and their two kids were here, I'm sure, just a couple of years, but in the second year he decided that—or they decided—they were going to make a try at making a go of it as free-lance writers. And to do that they had to make as much money as they could in that year, so they'd have enough to live a year in California, which is what they wanted to do.

Tina took a job as a dealer, and she became one of the quickest studies and one of the best dealers that they ever had. And she worked the night shift and got progressively upset by what she kept watching night after night, after night. But the night that finally finished her, she did tell about, there was a very sweet little old lady who had been pulling two dollar-slot machines all night, and winning a little bit and then losing a little bit. And she would pull the slot machines and gain a little

and lose a little, and finally she'd be broke, and she'd reach in her purse and get another bill and change it into silver dollars and play some more and that'd be gone. And finally along about four in the morning, she was broke again, and she walked away from the machines, and then she came back; then she walked away again. Finally she got her purse out and the checkbook, went back and she had to go clear to the cashier's cage to get a check cashed.. She went back and got the check cashed and came back with her silver dollars and couldn't remember which machine she had been playing. And she got frantic—the superstition, of course, you know, is that if you feed the machines, they then are more likely to pay back. She went back and forth and got almost frantic, like a rat in a maze, and couldn't find it, and finally just collapsed on the floor. And that was the night Tina quit!

[Laughs] But then the happy ending is that she and Laurie wrote a Saturday Evening Post story out of it and got twenty-five hundred dollars, which was enough additional to stake them for the year, and they went to Hollywood, and he made a success as a free-lance writer. So it [laughing] was kind of a nice story.

But then Ray Pflug was another one who was here about that time. He is over in San Mateo now where he's teaching. These people did not have Ph.D.'s and they were here only temporarily. Laurie Mascott and Ray Pflug decided not to get the degrees. And they come back once in a while in sort of alumni kind of thing they feel about Nevada. A lot of people went through the department in those days, staying two or three years. And most of them, I think, have good feelings about the University and like to come back from time to time, and I hear from them fairly regularly.

I have trouble keeping the time straight. Walter [Van Tilburg] Clark must have started

teaching about that time—maybe late forties, early fifties, Walter was on the staff. Let's see, Rodney Connor came—no, he came down later. I'm trying to think who was on the staff when Stout came. Certainly Morrison was there. [A. Stuart] Daley would have been there—Daley, and Morrison, Laird. Hume—the year Laird and Eldridge and I were here in 1945, Hume had taken a job at University of British Columbia, and he did go up there for a year and didn't like it very well, and applied to return and was allowed to return. So Hume came back, then, in 1946, after having been gone a year. He had been here from '43 or '44 (I guess he'd been here before), but then went to British Columbia, and then came back in '46 when we needed more staff.

And the speech department, of course, was part of the English department, and Robert Griffin and Bill Miller were both in the department. And then about that time I hired a new speech teacher. Oh, Miller left, I guess, along in there sometime. He was on leave, and he finished his Ph.D. and got another job and went to Alabama someplace. Again, he disliked it and came back. And he must have come back around 1948, something like that—'49. And those were the main group.

The period when we first came out here in 1945-46 was an extremely interesting period from the point of view of teaching because of the students we got with the G.I. bill and the World War II veterans who came out. And Nevada has always had a number of exceptionally good students who come here for various reasons: some to get into a small institution; some because it's a cosmopolitan kind of community and their parents come from different parts of the world and are here, although the high out-of-state tuition has discouraged some of that and we have a much lower percentage of out-of-state students than we used to have. And of course, a lot of the

state's very good students get scholarships and go out of state, but in those days we did have a group of extremely good students in English, particularly, and I think in other departments as well.

Oh, I think of several A students we had. One of them, Gene Grotegut, who's now in foreign language department, was one of those good students. Gary Adams, who's a minister in California and whose parents were the owners of Gray Reid's store at the time; George Bennett was a top-notch student; Barney Childs, who became a Rhodes scholar—he was back a couple of years ago to one of those alumni participation days or whatever it's called, and you know, he's teaching at Redlands, I think (I'm not sure where he is). Huling Ussery was a good student at the time. But we had a dozen really top-notch students who worked very hard, and they were bright and imaginative and mature enough after the war that they were serious about what they were doing. And it was a really very satisfactory teaching what we had at the time. I'm not sure we've ever had quite so good a group as that bunch of them was. And most of them were highly successful. But anyway, it was a pleasant time to teach.

One of my students this summer told me that they had seen a new issue of Brushfire magazine, and I was remembering that group established the Brushfire magazine. They put in some money out of their pockets and collected a little money from those of us on the faculty and did it. The first volume was not called Brushfire; I can't think what they called it now. It was a much fancier name—had a gray cover and red type, and I can see it, but I can't remember the name of it! But that was the first one; the next year somebody kept it going, and they did get ASUN support, and published it as Brushfire magazine. And of course, it's had its ups and downs over the

years. That first year it was about half faculty, I think. I remember Hume had some poems in it, and I think I did, and I think Laird had some, and Walter Clark—that kind of thing. They may have had some professional pieces, too, but I'm not sure now.

With only three of us on the regular staff in some of those days, we were not only teaching fairly large loads, we were teaching a considerable variety of things. It was really a very good training, you know; we didn't have any notions of proprietary rights in any courses, and we did work up quite a lot of new courses each semester. And we did also fairly near there work out a kind of orderly curriculum, or it seemed orderly to us; it's been modified considerably since. But we did work out a scheme whereby with the small staff we thought we could provide a respectable English major and at the same time cover the freshman English. And that scheme I won't describe, but it was a fairly obvious one. But it has been modified considerably since. And one of the problems with the English curriculum now is that it's got the remnants of that old scheme, and then quite a number of different schemes superimposed on it, so that it goes off in quite a number of directions. But we put in a number of new courses.

You mentioned the separation of the speech and the English department, and I was wondering what prompted that division, how was it handled?

I can't remember now—I can't remember when it occurred even.

1956.

Oh, well, good. I don't remember anything complicated about it. It was—let's see in '56, I

don't know whether I was back as chairman of the English department or not. I think I was chairman of the English department then. And I just can't remember why or how. Well, the reasons were the usual reasons, of course, that the department was bigger, that they had different motives, and it was a perfectly amicable separation, as far as I can remember. Just the speech department wanted its own program and its own direction. I can't remember that there was any problem or personality conflict involved.

How were chairmen selected by the departments?

They were appointed by the dean, and most of them were regarded as "heads" and acted as department heads, with the distinction that the chairman theoretically serves a set term and then is succeeded by another, whereas the head serves at the pleasure of the dean, which in some instances meant practically forever. After the title was changed from "head" to "chairman," there were still these differences in the way they were chosen. But when I first came here at that time it was simply the dean making a decision.

After Irwin became dean, he was pretty scrupulous about seeking departmental advice before making an appointment of a chairman; he tended to do that in a quite laborious, but I think in some ways very effective way. What Irwin would do, he'd call each member of the department in individually and get his opinion about possible candidates for the chairmanship. And that took a tremendous lot of time. And in a way it was a kind of election, although he didn't take a poll or anything of that sort and go by the majority of opinion. He simply—what he usually did in practice was make the appointment and then call people in to make them happy with it. That's what really was happening [chuckling], but it didn't work

out—I mean the appointment was not really made; it was just that he sort of made up his mind, usually, and got it confirmed.

I've heard that he was not particularly well liked.

No, he was not. He was respected in a lot of ways, but not well liked. He had almost no sense of humor, so far as anybody could tell, or at least it was hard to identify the humor. He did occasionally try to tell a joke at the faculty meeting, but it was almost always a disaster. But no, Ralph had a way of being negative on almost all subjects, which is not a bad trait in a dean in some ways. That is, you went in with something, and you'd assume that he would say no. Then you started arguing. Well, this is a fairly good administrative ploy; it immediately puts you in a position of some strength [laughs] with whoever is after things!

I used to argue with Ralph at great length and fuss with him. I discovered fairly early—Ralph had been a Baptist preacher, I think, sometime or other, and I discovered fairly early that profanity shocked him. I'm not particularly addicted to profanity, but whenever I really wanted anything from Ralph, I'd get on the phone, and he'd say no, and then I'd say, "Now Goddamn it, Ralph!" [laughs], and that almost always shocked him into some recognition at least!

But he did have quite a number of people among the Arts and Science chairmen, who found him exasperating, at least. And as I say, I always got along with him pretty well, but he was not a popular dean. And he was not as he became vice president then.

And this uh—the vice presidency was really a kind of staff position [for] Ralph; it was not a—it was not a line position. And what he mostly did was look minutely at every piece of paper that came up, and he was very

good on details. And you didn't dare send in an application without having all the proper machinery and all the proper background and all the transcripts properly stamped; he checked all that stuff himself, which takes a tremendous amount of time. But he was very conscientious about that kind of thing, and worked long hours. But in the faculty's eyes in many ways, he was a paper shuffler rather than somebody they respected— scrupulously honest and known for that.

I don't know how long he was in that vice president's job—not very long, I think, really. I think he was the first, though, to have a vice president's title, and he did have primarily a kind of staff position. Recommendations didn't go to him or through him; he simply went through and screened them for accuracy and completeness (a little as Ginny Kersey does it for me)

Was that, then, a case of bumping him upstairs to get him out of the dean's position?

Oh, there may have been a little of that; at least that was part of the arrangement because he was—. Oh, I remember the departmental chairmen of English had taken to having meetings without him, in which they made plans for what life would be like if he were not there [chuckles]—things like that. And so there was some pressure for him to be out, but there also was, I think, need for a vice president or at least for an assistant to the president. And in a way, that's what he was, was an assistant to the president, I think, when he was vice president. But there was that need.

THE MINARD STOUT ADMINISTRATION

Well, I might just as well go at it chronologically, insofar as I can remember. Malcolm Love had left. He'd gone down to San Diego where he was president for a long time. And the University had had fairly short terms for presidents, which isn't terribly unusual; but in the fall of that year, several of us were concerned about how short the tenure of presidents had been, and particularly since Love had left of his own accord rather than [chuckling] being fired.

I remember distinctly a meeting during the summer—I think it probably was a meeting of that Faculty Welfare Committee or Advisory Committee—I can't think what the name of it was. And I remember that Maurice Beesley, who was chairman of it, and I, who was sort of secretary of it, stayed afterward, along with—my memory is Frank Richardson in the biology department, maybe Dwight Billings, biology department. But there were half a dozen of us around, and we agreed that when the new president was hired, all of us were going to do all we could to try to make him welcome and to be friendly.

And I remember that the first week that Stout was here we had him over for dinner—his wife hadn't come yet, and we had him over for dinner. And we had Harold and Mabel Brown (Harold was dean of Education), and we had them and Stout over for dinner. And he was very pleasant; he drank three martinis, as I remember, and he had cigars, which we smoked, and it was all very friendly. (I remember that he made much of the cigars, Pittsburgh Stogies that he ordered by the box.)

Among other things, we talked a little about the new branch we had just started in Las Vegas. Brown and I had gone down to Las Vegas that same year and had set up a program there. We'd taken Jim Dickinson, who was an instructor in English and had not finished his Ph.D. and was coming up to an "up or out" deadline on the campus here. And we bribed him into going down to Las Vegas for a few years by saying that he would have three more years to finish his Ph.D., and we made that exception to the rules. And Harold Brown and I took Jim down to Las Vegas and spent a week there and hired

a couple of rooms in the high school and visited Maude Frazier, who was a legislator wanting to get through a bill to set up a new university in Las Vegas, and got Maude sort of backed off her project with the promise that we'd get something going as a branch of the University. We hired some part-time faculty to work along with Jim and registered about twenty students, and I remember writing news releases that would go out one a day for the next few days, and we turned around and came home, saying, "Have fun, Jim!"—which he apparently did. But anyway, we talked a little about that with Stout, I remember, and all seemed fairly pleasant.

Early in the fall, Stout had a faculty meeting, and during the course of the faculty meeting, noted that he had seen that on the campus there was concern about entrance requirements and some interest in increasing entrance requirements, so that not every high school student would get in, which was pretty much the state of affairs. And Stout invited any information or faculty comments on the subject of entrance requirements.

And I don't know how long after that faculty meeting, but fairly soon after it, Frank Richardson, who was in the biology department, ran into an article by Arthur Bestor in—it was the University of Illinois at the "Aimlessness in Education." Frank read the article, thought it was significant in what it said about entrance requirements generally; and so he sent for offprints of it and distributed them to various people on the campus, including the president, and including the dean of Education, and including most department chairmen. And he was president of AAUP at the time, and he did it presumably as a comment that the president had invited on entrance requirements.

Well, the president apparently did not notice the emphasis on entrance requirements

so much as he noticed the attack on education courses and programs in the College of Education. And Stout was a fairly fresh Ed.D. from the University of Iowa, where he had done a dissertation on the financing of extracurricular activities in high schools in southeast or southwest Iowa (I've forgotten where), a survey of how they financed extracurricular activities. And he immediately apparently interpreted this as an attack on himself, and on the College of Education. And he did not get that from Brown.

Then he did send a fairly scathing memo to Richardson. There were various phrases in it that almost come back to me. They were, not to be a busybody all over the campus: "...faculty members are to stick to their own disciplines and not be busybodies all over the campus"—I seem to remember that phrase. And then a threat at the end that if there was any more of this, they'd be fired. And Richardson, as a tenured professor, thought that was a little extreme. And Richardson did take it to the Faculty Advisory Committee or Welfare Committee, whatever that committee is, the name of which I can't remember. Maurice Beesley was chairman of it, and I was the secretary, and there were various other committee members on it. We did discuss it with Richardson.

And then we went to the president and discussed it with him and tried to work things out, and did, I think, sort of get a kind of resolution. At least the president agreed he was not going to tire Richardson, and Richardson agreed to settle without an apology as long as nothing was going to happen. And so it sort of worked out.

But, apparently, it had not worked out as well as anybody thought, and in the spring Lairds and flumes and we went of f to Saline Valley, which is a totally deserted valley down to the west of Death Valley. It's a beautiful

spot, totally uninhabited, just as low as Death Valley in there—very warm. And we went in there and camped for three or four days during spring vacation. We came home and found signs stuck to our doors: “Please call as soon as you get in town no matter how late it is.” And there was one of these from Frank Richardson; and another from Bruce Thompson, an attorney who is now Federal Judge Bruce Thompson; and another from Ed Olsen at the newspaper.

And so I guess we tried Frank, and his wife said no, Frank had gone over to Bruce Thompson’s, and word was we were to go over there immediately.

Well, we called Bruce Thompson’s, and Bruce said, “Oh, all sorts of things have been happening.” (This was eleven o’clock at night or something like that.) “We’re sitting here meeting. You better come over.

And so the three of us, who didn’t know quite what had happened but were curious, did go over. And we got over there and were told that (this was Saturday or Sunday) they were quite sure that we had in the registered mailbox in the post office (where we couldn’t get it, of course, till Monday), that we had copies of a letter which went through a series of things saying we had, oh, done various things like destroying relations between the University and the schools, and attacked our president, and things like that. Therefore, we were to appear before the Board of Regents on the following Saturday at a certain time (each of us had a different time) and show cause why we should not be dismissed from the University.

Well, this seemed strange, and Bruce Thompson and Leslie Gray (another attorney who is still in Reno), and maybe just the two of them were there that night, but their advice immediately was that we should join in a suit to the supreme court to get an

injunction against this, that this was clear railroading and we were going to be in trouble with it.

Well, Laird and Hume and I, apparently more naive and less aware of what went on in the world, didn’t immediately agree, and went home sort of saying, “Oh, this must be a joke or a mistake. All we’ve got to do is explain this to the board, and they’ll—and these are absurd; we’ve done nothing of the kinds of things there. We just have to go in Saturday and tell them about it, and do it.”

Well, we were finally convinced rightly by the attorneys (and Fred Anderson, a doctor who was a friend, got in the act), and they persuaded us at once that if we went into that Saturday hearing, we were just asking to be fired, that there was no intent whatsoever to make a hearing out of that, that they were working on trying to make it look as if we were Communist sympathizers or something. This was getting near the McCarthy era. All that kind of thing was in the background; then we’d better get in on the suit right away. Well, he did convince us, and some more attorneys came in to help: Dick Blakey, who is now part of the firm of Woodburn, Blakey, Wedge, Folsom, and somebody else—the, I think the biggest law firm in town. Dick Blakey was one of my attorneys, and Gordon Rice was another; Bert Goldwater came in—. This was all volunteer assistance. And they did draft a petition to the supreme court to stop these hearings.

And so on Saturday morning, with the advice of the attorney, I, since my name came first alphabetically, I was scheduled for a hearing at nine o’clock. And at about two minutes till nine I showed up at the president’s office, where the hearing before the Board of Regents was to be held, and almost simultaneously, as if he were dashing up on a white charger, somebody pulled up with a

governor's office plate on the car in front of the office and came running in with an injunction preventing the hearings [laughing]! And by that time, of course, the newspapers had made much of it, and there was standing room only in what was then the president's office and the hallway around it. And when the supreme court man came in, there was much cheering, and so the injunction was there.

And then all during the day this same routine was sort of repeated. Hume was on it at nine-thirty, and again there was the injunction [chuckling]; Hume went up and was told the hearing would not be held. And then Laird, and then the other person had got a letter, Tom Little, in biology—that was one who had also received one of these notices. And Frank Richardson.

Well, there was a great deal of furor; the newspapers picked it up. Actually Stout, or whoever had done it, sort of unwittingly had picked on the five of us, who were reasonably popular and reasonably well known in the community as well, so that there was a lot of furor around town, the newspaper stories, and so on. And on Sunday, Stout called and asked Rune and Laird and me to come in for individual conferences and see if we couldn't settle this. And we went in, and Stout was just sweet as pie: this was never intended as anything disparaging; he certainly wanted everything to go in harmony around here; couldn't we work this out? And he'd just been trying to take care of things between the board and the University, and he hoped we'd cooperate with him, and that he wanted to reinstate us and wanted us to be back in good standing, and why don't we just withdraw and forget all this stuff.

Well, he got us one at a time, and this all seemed terribly reasonable and sweet, and so each of us were, "Sure, don't want any trouble; we'll stay on." Well, we didn't realize that he

was not doing the sane thing with Little and Richardson at all. Well, no, with Little they did, but they had decided to make the fall guy out of Richardson. And so Little again had the charges all withdrawn, as Laird and Hume and I did after that. But they left the charges over Richardson and decided that he was going to be fired, although he hadn't been dismissed. But they would go in for the dismissal, and it would stand. And they decided that in the case of Richardson. And he was not called in for the individual hearing, and they started trying to get evidence to make the dismissal stick, because he did, soon after he got the word, appeal it through committees and that kind of thing.

Well, what the board decided to do, then, was to hold an open hearing on Richardson and his appeal that he not be fired at the end of that year for insubordination or whatever it was. And the committee, interestingly, that was to hear this appeal was the Board of Regents. So the board fired Richardson and then became the appeals court to listen to his appeal. And in the meantime a number of faculty were solicited to try to go out and collect evidence against Richardson and his character and things like that.

And things were pretty uncomfortable through all this time; anonymous letters were floating around. I remember we got one anonymous letter about the sexual life of English professors and so on, how the English department always was having wife-trading parties, and things like that—just a, you know, whole cloth kinds of slanderous stuff. Nobody ever knew where the anonymous letters came from. We tried checking typewriters with some places and never got anywhere with that kind of amateur sleuthing. But anyway, things were unpleasant all around. And the faculty was pretty clearly divided into pro- and anti-Richardson camps.

And finally one week before final examinations, in the old education auditorium which is now that auditorium in Thompson Student Services, the board came up to hold its hearings on the Richardson business with witnesses being called from both sides, and the audience filled with students who were cutting their study and their examination period—a terrible time to do it—half the student body there to watch their professors perjure themselves, and the Board of Regents, and a whole battery of attorneys. We had cut the number of attorneys on the Richardson side to three; it was Leslie Gray and Bruce Thompson and Bert Goldwater (seems to me there was one other), oh yes, Ralph Wittenberg, another attorney. And the hearings were held with those four attorneys there, and the regents were, of course, being the judges and the jury. The regents had as their attorney Lester Summerfield, who was the attorney for the board. And [Harlan] Reward. His son is down at—his son is John.

But anyway, these attorneys were arranged, and the Board of Regents sat on the stage without any robes, but in a kind of very judicial situation. And the attorneys called witnesses and so on.

We had had some help in getting materials ready, among other things. I think it was before the hearing, a group (called Friends of the University) of citizens downtown had been formed, and this group ultimately turned out to be very important. Before the hearings, I think they hadn't done very much, but they, I think, were getting organized. Helen Wittenberg, wife of the attorney Ralph Wittenberg (she died a few years ago of a heart attack)—Helen had been working zealously collecting information and materials that Richardson could use. John and Miriam Chism were on the committee; John was later mayor of Reno, and Miriam was Walter

Van Tilburg Clark's sister. Sam and Edda Houghton were on that Friends committee. Gosh, I forget who all it was, but it was a very active group of highly-respected citizens with a good deal of influence.

Well, then the hearings then proceeded for, I think, a couple of days with witnesses being called. I was called and asked various kinds of questions—I'm not sure now what—oh, most of 'em had to do with the catalog and some kind of question a]out whose names had been put in the catalog. I was editor of the catalog. And there was some kind of problem, I think, that the president's office had taken Richardson's name of f the catalog copy, or maybe they put it on—I've forgotten what it was [laughing]! Or maybe they changed the designation—. But anyway, it was a lot of the questioning that I had.

The most interesting things, though, were some other kinds of things. Along in the course of the trial, it became obvious and we had been warned that there would be attempts to tie this in with Communism, and that that was one of the things the regents and their attorneys were going to do. So we did know about this. I hadn't done anything about it, but it turned out that the attorney for the board did decide to raise this particular specter, and he picked Tom Little, the biologist, to do it with, which was an amazingly bad choice and an indication of a great lack of homework on the part of the regents' attorney. They didn't need any, since they knew what the verdict was going to be before they started. But [chuckles] the attorney, I remember, would ask Little questions like, "Well, do you think that anyone who is an avowed Communist should be allowed to be in a university?"

And I remember Little reaching into his pocket and pulling this out: "Well, as Senator Robert Taft has said. . . And he had a quotation from Taft, just laying it out

[laughing] very beautifully, and quoting the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, and all sorts of things. So that one didn't go very well.

And then a series of other questions—Little had all sorts of things. And, “Do you know what happened at such-and-such a meeting?” And he reached in his pocket again, which prompted one of—we had New York Times reporters there for the whole thing. And it was very much celebrated. But one of the lines that I remember got quoted in the New York Times. Well, there were two of them. One of them, the *New York Times* delighted in the flat fact that Stout in his letter originally had mixed up *implied*—*imply* and *infer*, and used them in the wrong way. And so they kept quoting that with “sics” after it every time they had a chance [laughing]! But the other one they picked up was that Little on one occasion reached in his pocket again and pulled out some notes, and Regent Newton Crumley said in a whisper that could be heard all over the place and especially by the New York Times reporters, “All these assholes keep notes!” [Laughs] And the New York 7-vines picked that up with great glee.

But Little's questioning went on, and he handled it all beautifully. And then finally the attorney got more and more exasperated, and [in a gruff voice], “Well, are you a Communist?” Which caused some hilarity.

And Little reached in his pocket again and said, “You might want to read this.” And it was a complete clearance from the FBI to do a special sensitive research on [laughing] biological effects of bombs in the state of Nevada or something.

So that luckily was the end of the Communist witchhunt. And it was in a way good luck because I suppose I had been guilty of things like sending money to the Spanish loyalists or maybe attending a Young

Communist League meeting sometime or other. But Little never had, and Richardson also was a Republican and a good church member, and had three kids and it was just amazing that they would have picked on Richardson.

Well, the hearing went on. There were visitors here from AAUP chapters all over the West. There were letters that came in; the newspapers didn't print many of the letters sent from the AAUP chapters, but there were letters from almost all of them to the newspapers and the Board of Regents deploring it. And it was a strange case. I remember getting telephone calls from the president of the AAUP chapter at Berkeley, who did come over here, Jim Caldwell in foreign languages. And before he came over, Jim had called and said, “Well, now we've got the word on this, and obviously we've got to come over and protest, but would you just tell me off the record what's wrong with this guy [Richardson]? That's really behind all this? You can tell me; we're going to support it anyway.” And I got the same thing from UCLA.

These people simply couldn't believe that there wasn't something funny about Richardson, you see, that made them do this. And there really wasn't. He was the least likely person to be labeled a troublemaker or to be labeled—but he was very soft spoken, spoke slowly, very deliberately, never seemed to lose his temper or raise his voice, just totally the opposite of the kind of person you get. Usually, you know, when you've got one of these protest cases that you have to support on principle, you kind of wish you didn't have to because the guy is obnoxious [laughing] one way or another, but there was nothing of that sort going on with Richardson at all. It was just a strange one.

But in spite of all these other protests from other institutions (which meant nothing at all

to the board; Nevada did not have to listen to California or any other places like that), and in spite of all that, the hearing went on.

And another kind of interesting episode that I happen to remember was the case of Charles Rogers Hicks, who was the chairman of the history department, as one of the examples of the sort of pathetically bad things that went on from the point of view of students. And Hicks was interviewed by the attorney for the Board of Regents. "Professor Hicks, did you receive an article by Arthur Bestor from Frank Richardson at some time last fall?"

And Hicks, "Yes, indeed, I did."

"Do you remember getting it?"

"Oh, I remember it distinctly."

"What did you do with it?"

"I glanced at it and saw that it was an attack on our president, and I threw it in the wastebasket immediately."

"You mean you didn't read it completely?"

"I could tell at a glance what kind of attack it was, and I didn't want to have anything to do with that sort of material."

"Did you regard this as an attack on the president?"

"I certainly did."

"Did you think that your colleague, Mr. Richardson, should have been sending it?"

"I certainly did not think he should have sent that around."

And then the regents' attorney sat down, and Richardson's attorney got up. "Professor Hicks, would you look at this note."

"Yes."

"Do you recognize the handwriting?"

"Yes, I do."

"Do you notice the date on it?"

"Yes." He gave the date.

"Would you read the note, please."

And so [chuckles] he made poor old Charlie Hicks read a note in which he had

said something to the effect of: "Dear Frank: I got your article today by Arthur Bestor, and it seems to me to say what should have been said a long time ago. I'm certainly glad you included me here, and I agree with everything the article said..., this kind of stuff, you know."

Well, that kind of thing went on all through the hearings, and it was a pretty distressing time on the whole—students listening to all this. And there were hoots and catcalls in the audience, and—far, far from the dignity of an educational institution! [Laughs]

But the board did confer at the conclusion of all this, in which it was pretty clearly and decisively proved, I think, that Richardson had not been doing anything for which he deserved to be fired. And so the board at the conclusion did unanimously vote that he should be dismissed. And Frank did leave; he got a fellowship, a Yale fellowship, to do research on marine birds in Hawaii. And at the same time the attorneys filed an appeal with the Nevada Supreme Court on Richardson's dismissal.

In the meantime, the four others of us had been restored there. The only difference was that we got no salary increases for the next year. And then people like Charlie Hicks, who had lied so incompetently, got a whopping salary increase, and this was pretty typical all the way through. Tom Little in biology took a job at UCLA or Riverside. I've forgotten where Tom went, but he was enough annoyed by the lack of salary increase and so on that was there that he left. Laird and Hume and I were mad enough, but we stayed on in spite of the salary cut.

I took a Fulbright to Australia that year as a way of getting away from things. And we went by ship to Australia. We went at the middle of the semester, went by ship to Australia and stopped to see Richardsons in Hawaii on the way, I remember. And I spent

the year in Australia on a Fulbright. Laird and Hume stayed here. And the supreme court case went forward, and sometime during that year the supreme court did in a decision by Judge Milton Badt reverse the board's position, ordered Richardson reinstated, and ordered the board to put him back in his position when he returned from the Hawaii fellowship, which the board complied with. Incidentally, because of the time change, I got the word on the decision— as far as the date was concerned, I got the word before it was known in Nevada [laughs] that the supreme court had reversed the decision.

Richardson came back in the fall and was finally driven out just by the remaining bad feeling. He was getting anonymous letters. I remember on two or three occasions somebody put rubber bands in his pipe tobacco— just all kinds of petty little things— notes on his door: “We don't need you here”— this kind of thing, in the office door—just incredible stuff, none of which we could ever track down. I don't know where it came from. But Richardson had enough of that and was ignored enough in his department—they had brought in somebody to replace him during the year, and that person was very nasty, talking about his incompetence and that kind of thing. And also somebody else had moved into the chairmanship, and he was frightened of Richardson, because Richardson had been chairman and it might threaten his position. So we never knew which of those were involved or whether any of them were, but anyway Richardson had a bad enough time that he took a job as a curator of the museums in the University of Washington in Seattle and went up there, and retired just a couple of years ago. I hear from him still once in a while; he's retired and has a cabin someplace in Victoria or Vancouver. He seems to be very happy there.

And he's always been—well, again, the type of person who just never gets involved in this kind of thing. There're all sorts of stories about him; he was very much interested in the outdoors and in nature. I remember one story about Frank stopping on top of Donner Pass one day—saw something in the road, and he went out and there was a dead eagle out there that had been hit by a car or something. And Frank picked it up and took it with the comment, oh, he'd never tasted eagle meat; he wondered what it was like. So he took that tired eagle home and cooked—[laughing] tried eagle meat! But he was not the kind to be put off by it.

Justice Badt's decision was pretty decisive, and in effect, I guess I've had the only tenure guaranteed by the supreme court around here [laughing] for some time— Laird, and Hume, and I. But it did make it clear that the board could not violate its own rules and behave in a manner that denied constitutional recourse. But there were no damages.

And in the meantime, there were recriminations against those who had supported Richardson: Harold Brown, who was dean of Education, who had refused to testify against Richardson on the grounds that he was being criticized in the article— Brown was removed from the deanship; John Morrison in the English department, who had testified in favor of Richardson, had his salary cut; Fritz Melz in foreign languages had his salary cut. Let's see, who else would have been—there were several people: Ralph Irwin, who had zealously refused to take sides, was made dean of Arts and Science; Higginbotham, and Dean [Elaine] Mobley, and the people who had worked very zealously for Stout trying to collect evidence against Richardson—that was their assignment; they were supposed to go out and try to find things that could

be used against Richardson—and they were rewarded by salary increases.

But the whole business was distressing enough that the—. And Stout was still there, and Stout had the support of a majority of the faculty, I think, just because it's always true that whoever is dishing out the salary increases and is in power is likely to have a certain amount of support. So things were still not good; there was a lot of arguing and bickering back and forth. Stout went from time to time—made overtures toward being friendly, and they were generally sort of accepted, although we were not willing to give him credit for complete honesty in these efforts.

And in the meantime the “Friends of the University,” so-called, had expanded. They had got one member on the Board of Regents elected (one of the five)—Bruce Thompson. The Friends of the University were partly behind the election of Bruce Thompson to the Board of Regents, so that he became a minority of one on the board so far as support of Stout was concerned. And Stout continued to do things that the faculty considered fairly high-handed. His background had been administrator of the University High School spent, or the last two, at least, were spent with this tense situation with the board trying to decide when was the time to do it, and having—well, no, it took some time for the board to expand enough to do it. But the board has had nine members since that time. And the reason for expanding it from five to nine was simply that, so they could get a majority to fire Stout. And Stout did leave, and Charlie Armstrong came, I guess, didn't he, after Stout? And he did immediately start changing things.

The step I left out, however, the legislature did get into the act before Stout was finally fired. The legislature sot into the act and appropriated money (I've forgotten how

much—something like, I don't know, twenty, twenty-five thousand dollars) for investigation of the University by an outside group. And then the board did appoint, or did the legislature appoint now? (Can't remember who appointed the board. One reason I can't is that I know Gary Adams, who was I think in the state assembly at the time, was one of the people who was looking around for names—maybe it was a joint effort; I don't know.) But anyway, it did appoint a committee from outside, and the committee did come in and do a two- or three-week investigation, and wrote a long report, which is in the library. I think maybe it had the name of the chairman on it, the McHenry report, it was called. And it was a long and reasonably objective and not a one-sided report, at least; although it was clear that the bias of the committee was against Stout. This was quite apparent. And from the makeup of the committee, this was inevitable. The committee was not packed; I was accused [laughing] of having packed the committee, but by pure accident the chairman of the committee was Dean McHenry, who had been an old friend of mine in Australia, and we had known each other then! And it was a fine choice. And then the person to investigate in English, whom McHenry appointed, was an even more blatant one, and this never came out, but the person in English was Dick Lillard, who had been my office mate for three years at Indiana University [laughs]. And I didn't even know about that appointment till he showed up here, and he had forgotten I was here, too, I think. But there were obvious lines of communication available during those days.

But this report was a kind of significant report on the subject of academic freedom and faculty rights and equity and salary, and this kind of thing. It did make general observations that were very sensible. It was

a good committee, but it did include quite a number of—I'm trying to think of the man who was chairman of political science at USC, a very nice guy, but he had been president of AAUP down there for two or three terms, and so he was likely not to be pleased by what Stout had been doing. And I can't remember the other members of the McHenry committee now. The president at University of the Pacific was one, and I forget his name. But it was a good report, and it did again lead pretty directly to the firing of Stout.

One of the sort of pathetic figures in the whole thing was Fred Wood, who was the dean of Arts and Science. And Wood had always been very friendly with me and with Laird and Hume. He had hired all three of us, and he had generally favored us with promotions and salary and things like that. And we'd all worked fairly hard for him; I'd done a lot of, oh, sort of pseudo-administrative stuff for him, like writing reports, and editing the catalog, and things like that. And we'd been really pretty close.

And on the other hand, Wood was a company man from way back. And he was really, I think, torn when this whole thing broke because he, I think, did not want us to be fired; on the other hand, he could not go against the president. And it's too bad, he could have come out of it a hero, and he was retiring at the end of the year anyway, but he didn't want to. And the thing I remember, I guess, in some ways more painfully than anything else was Fred Wood's efforts to try to work a compromise or to be friendly and try to work things out, and I'm sure as much to take care of his conscience as do us any good.

But I remember he had Rune and Laird and me over for lunch one day, and his wife had been my secretary, as a matter of fact, and very friendly; she was very good. But

she wasn't there this day, and Fred Wood had had us, and he'd gone downtown and bought a bottle of gin. Re was a teetotaler, but he had heard rumors about the wildness in the English department; he'd thought we'd probably want a drink before lunch, which was the last thing any of us wanted [laughing] on that particular occasion! But he sort of pathetically tried to offer us a drink, and he wouldn't've known how to make it anyway. And then talked about couldn't we compromise, wouldn't we just—if we would just agree not to support Richardson, he was sure he could make things good with the president, and we'd be all right. And why did we need to stick with Richardson anyway? Richardson had circulated this stuff, and he hadn't behaved very well. Sort of a horrible meeting, as I think back on it.

And we were polite, although we were all three very angry that even the suggestion of that kind of—it was really bribery, the suggestion, you know, in a very nice way. And I'm sure he didn't think of it that way, but that's what it was. [Laughing] And we were all very angry, but we were polite.

I've always felt sorry for him, and he left at the end of that year without really any regrets much, and it's too bad because he'd been very strong for academic standards. He'd done a great deal to build the University, and he just left kind of like a dog with his tail between his legs. It wasn't really very pleasant for anybody.

I remember Bob Hume, oh, a year or two afterward, tried to write a novel based on it, and it just would not come off. He was too close to it. One thing I remember—I don't know where any of it is—one thing, I remember the chapter heading. He called it "Gnats in Paradise" or something, and he made some kind of nice parallels between what was going on at the University and where we were, because this spring vacation

we'd been in Saline Valley, a simply beautiful, totally deserted place; we'd had a fine three days of camping and so on, except that there were some sand fleas or sand gnats that turned up, which were absolutely impossible. If you took your shirt off for one minute, you had the things all over you, and it turned out they were the kind that sort of burrowed in you; they were like chiggers or something. You scratched and dug for weeks afterward. And he made some points likening what had gone on at the University [laughing] with gnats that were down there! But the novel never came off.

In the process, I should have mentioned, too, there was a lot of—not only did the New York Times get into it, but at one stage in the process, before the Richardson hearings, Walter Clark, who was in the English department, and we talked a lot, and Walter was outraged at the whole affair. And Walter finally decided that he simply could not stay here in good conscience under those circumstances, and so he resigned. And as he resigned, wrote a really good and somewhat scathing letter of resignation. He had all sorts of job offers. But he went to the University of Montana, finally. But the letter got quoted in Time magazine, which added a good deal. I can remember one phrase, that Stout's purpose was to create a manageable mediocrity in the University, which was a very accurate description of Stout's administrative philosophy, I think. Plus the fact that I think Stout really had a kind of at least mild paranoia. I remember fairly early, his recounting how he had been punished as a child for making mistakes in English. And you know, it was one of these standard things, "Oh, you're an English teacher, and I've got to watch the way I talk." And then this led to a confession that when he was a child, he had made mistakes and he had been punished

severely whenever he made one, and what—we're going to play at amateur psychology; I think it might have something to do with the motivation. Although I think the motivation was primarily from Silas E. Ross, and we never discovered what Ross was after, or why Ross should have picked the people he did, or why Ross was upset about 'em. Sometime afterward I asked Ross directly and didn't get any answer.

And the only [chuckles]—the only thing we've ever figured out is so silly that it may even be true: when we first came here, Moseley, the president, was one of the presidents who was reasonably zealous in using his entertainment budget to entertain the faculty. And it was a small faculty, and he had a party over in the dining hall or the gym or someplace—it was a fairly big party—for the entire faculty, a dinner, no less. And we ended up sitting with the Rosses and somebody else at the dinner. We had not sought out this company, but we ended there. And the entertainment that was provided was provided by three students who were majors in English and who indicated that they were majors in English, providing a skit which none of us knew anything about. The students were Gloria Napes (who's now Gloria Napes Walker), and Pat O'Brien (who's around town also still—I saw him not long ago), and Tosca Masini, who became Miss Nevada a year or two after that and is now Tosca Masini Means. But those three kids [laughing] did a skit, which was a takeoff on a radio show of the time called "Digger O'Dell." And the skit started out, "This is Moseley's Mortuary..." And they went on [laughing] with a total skit doing this kind of theme with Moseley and the administrators supposedly in a mortuary and making all sorts of fun of morticians and mortuaries and graves and so on. And here was Si Ross getting grimmer and grimmer and grimmer!

And so far as I have ever been able to ascertain—I'd talked to Tosca and Gloria soon afterward—I mentioned it to Gloria just the other day (I saw her downtown), and as far as I can tell, they swore and were totally innocent, had no notion that Ross was a mortician. It never occurred to them, you know, that an undertaker would be chairman of the Board of Regents [laughing]! But I have a strange feeling (it's the only thing I can think of) that Ross decided that we in the English department put these kids up to that and that we were not showing proper respect for his profession, which he took terribly seriously.

And along toward the end of this, people were trying sort of to mend fences. John Morrison in the English department met Ross one evening at a party, and Ross was being very friendly. And John said, "Well, yes, certainly we want to get things straightened out, Mr. Ross. I'd really like to talk to—I'd like to know what really happened so we can get this all straightened out, and everybody understands each other, and we have it all straight."

And Si, "Oh, yeah, you must come down. Why don't you just call me, and we'll make a date, and I do want to talk to you."

So the next morning, bright and early, Morrison called Si Ross, and they made an appointment for about a week hence. Morrison went around the whole department and everybody else collecting questions, things he could ask Ross. We were gonna find out what Ross really had motivating him in this whole business. And it was all going to be rosy, and we all sat around waiting for the report. And John went down to the mortuary at one in the afternoon.

He left the mortuary about three-thirty in the afternoon, and the entire time was taken up with a tour of the mortuary and a lecture on how important getting people properly

prepared to go to their Maker really was [laughing]. Ross gave him this long, long pitch about [laughing] the virtues of the profession and how he had come to Reno, and he had just looked at what went on in some of these burials, and he had decided that he was going to see that in the future the corpses of the good people of Reno were going to be treated with more respect. And so he had done this and had become a rich man doing it, incidentally.

One thing I didn't say anything about, and I was thinking on the way over that I can't remember much about in details, and that was Jake [Allvar N.] Jacobson's business. Jacobson was a sociologist, I think, and came to the University sometime after the Richardson affair, but did do some protesting, and as a result there were various kinds of penalties exacted from the president's office. And he protested, and there were hearings, and it was a very emotional and upsetting kind of affair. And Jacobson was ultimately squeezed out. And I just cannot remember details of how that worked; silly because it was occupying the whole campus at the time. And I just don't remember details of it.

As I understood it, he fired off a letter to Stout with copies to the governor and the Board of Regents, saying that Stout was tyrannical and oppressive, and then Stout called all his deans together and got some kind of a vote of support for himself.

Yeah, all that could have happened. I remember at the time Bob Hume and some others were singing a song called "The Singing Deans," but I can't think [chuckles] of the words to that either.

We had another song that I even have a recording of, of about that time, called "My Red, White and Blue Baby." That was directed more toward the McCarthy business than

the other. "If you're just one color, you better be white, but you've got to be three to be really right! Come and be my red, white and blue baby..."—I can't—how does the rest of that go? [Laughing] "Come and be my little investigatee! Oh, come and spill what's heard around the table—" No, can't remember the words to that.

But actually the Stout business was coupled with the McCarthy things. And well, I remember I was in Australia in 1953, it must have been, the year after the Stout business. And several of us left that next year for various reasons. I think I mentioned that I had taken a Fulbright to Australia and was teaching in University of Sydney. But I remember that I did a lot of talking around Australia, and had several subjects that I would suggest—these were mostly sponsored by the University Extension, and they mostly were Rotary Clubs out in the sheep country and around the rest of the country. And I had nice topics like "Education in America," or "The Current Views of American Literature," or—one popular one was "The American-Australian Language." But they were interesting; I would do the formal speech, and there would be polite applause, and then somebody in the back after a good deal of hesitation—I would have asked for questions, and somebody would hold up his hand and say, "Is this really true that there are no locks on the doors in Reno, Nevada? [Laughs] And that the gambling places are open all night?" And we'd go on with interminable questions about gambling and divorce and so on in Reno, which was much more interesting to them than education in America or anything else.

But the other question I got—the topic was the repression of academic freedom. And in the universities that was the topic I got both in questions and asked to talk about. So Nevada became relatively famous around

the world from the Stout affair. And I have still a banner headline from the Melbourne paper—I talked there to the Constitution Club or something—and one of the questions had to do with McCarthyism, and was I frightened of McCarthy and frightened to say what I thought academically. And I indicated that I was not, that I had no hesitation in saying what I thought about McCarthy, and I was happy to tell them, and I did make some comments about McCarthy and so on. And it made a banner headline in the Melbourne paper; they were convinced, you know, that nobody dared say a word in the United States for fear of losing his job or ending up in jail. And it's true that a lot of people were ending up in jail, but not that many.

Oh, I remember another story about Stout's giving this publicity around the world. Anatole Mazour, who taught history here, had left just before Stout came and became a sort of stalwart in the history department at Stanford (he's retired from Stanford three or four years ago, but he's still living there and still active), and Anatole became quite a famous scholar. But just after the Stout business here, Anatole was in Warsaw, I guess. Anatole was a White Russian refugee from Russia and had taught Russian history, and he was afraid to go back inside Russia at the time, just because of passport and other difficulties. But he was, I think it was in Warsaw, maybe it was in Helsinki, I can't remember, but somewhere in eastern Europe. And he met one day some members of the Communist party from the legislature, from the city council, wherever it was, and one of them said, "I don't suppose you would have lunch with a Communist."

And Anatole, "Of course, I would."

And, "Very well. We will have lunch on such-and-such a date." And they made a date for two weeks later or something like that.

And Anatole made a note and went home and agreed to meet them for lunch at twelve o'clock on this particular day. And on that particular day at about fifteen minutes after twelve, Anatole got a call at home. "We knew you were afraid to come meet with us. Americans don't—."

Anatole, "Oh!" And he'd forgotten it completely. "I will be there in ten minutes!" And he threw on his clothes and went rushing off to meet with the Communists.

But he got in the room, and they immediately again began commenting, "We knew you were afraid to meet with us. America has no academic freedom. There is no freedom of speech in America. We knew you would be afraid to meet with us." And Anatole protested some more, and then they said, "Ah, now we know about America. What about Nevada? What about 'Stoot'?" [Laughs] And they [laughing]—they apparently had picked this whole story up in Poland or wherever he was a year later and were taxing him with lack of academic freedom in Nevada because of "Stoot" [laughs], which was a story that Anatole was very fond of, surprisingly [laughing], since he had met Stout a time or two when he'd got back visiting—hadn't much use for him.

I did leave out the fact, too, that the AAUP did investigate. The AAUP was slow, but it did investigate the original dismissals and all the rest of it, and I guess Nevada was simply put on the list of censured campuses or something of that sort—or censured administrations. And again, the Board of Regents paid no attention to that kind of business. "We don't want these outsiders telling Nevadans what to do." It was very slow, the AAUP investigation, and the report didn't come out until maybe, oh, two or three years after the thing was over.

It was an interesting affair. Some years ago I turned over all my files to Ken Carpenter for

the Archives, and I think everybody else did. And he also, I'm sure, collected (I know he did because I helped him) a lot of papers were put together and kept, including a scrapbook and some other things by Helen Wittenberg who was head of the "Friends of the University" for a time. And she also had a lot of material on tape. I talked to Ralph, her husband, before he died, and after Helen had died, and I'm sure that Ken, who's a bulldog in hanging onto those things, I'm sure Ken did get all those tapes. And we were having trouble getting them just because Ralph wasn't sure where they were, but I'm sure Ken did get all that stuff. And also, oh, I remember I had a stack of files that [several inches] thick—reports I had done, you know, and speeches that I had never given but thought I might have to give [chuckles]. And I think Laird and Hume and—I guess Richardson didn't, but I know a lot of us had a lot of files from those days of various kinds of not very useful information, but information pertinent at the time. And I think we gave that all to the Archives. It's probably over there.*

This thing had had such a long, long life. And I talk to people now who still have very intense memories of this—.

Oh, yeah.

Why?

Well, partly because it was a very serious kind of thing and did generate very strong feelings; that is, here were people being presumably fired out of their jobs, and largely, simply for what were called to be speaking too directly on various subjects or having

*See Wittenberg papers, UNR Archives

different opinions in some instances. In fact, during the original business with Richardson, it was almost impossible to tie down; he really didn't do anything critical of the administration at all. He simply circulated an article that somebody else had written, which he circulated in order to make a comment on the problem of admissions. So that those who felt that this was an injustice were very much incensed, and that included townspeople as well as University faculty.

On the other hand, those who felt, as a great many did, that the president and administration can do no wrong, felt almost equally as strong against these people who were violating authority and were quote, "out of line" and this kind of thing. So that feeling was strong.

And then to complicate it, there was a good deal of very personal, not ideal or idealized attitude involved, but very personal attitude: if we're on the president's side, we get an eight-hundred-dollar raise; if we're on the other side, we don't get any raise. And this engendered quite a lot of strong feeling.

So that's one reason that it was very intense, and did really split the campus right down the middle. And I was amazed that it didn't take much longer than it did to get the campus at least on the surface back together again.

The other reason, I think, was that it was an interesting enough case that it did get a lot of national attention. There was the AMP investigation; I think I told you New York Times had a reporter here all the time; Walter Clark's essay made Time magazine; AMP chapters all over the country were sending telegrams; several of them in the West sent observers to the hearing to see what was going on. So Nevada got more publicity out of it than it had for any scientific accomplishments that it ever produced. And

so from that point of view, it put Nevada on the map in a way.

So I think for all those reasons it did tend to hang on. Although as I said a minute ago, I feel that the bitterness and the divisiveness, it really was over much more rapidly than I would have expected it to be. I thought the University would be set back for ten or fifteen years, and it wasn't.

One thing that helped was that we were not—. Well, the AAUP censureship was not as effective as it might have been because there were lots of people looking for jobs. And what usually happens if AAUP does restrict an institution in any way is that the people are afraid to take jobs in those places just for fear of what it will do for the reputation or fear that they'll get caught in the same kind of bind. And it was partly because there was such a boom in the whole teaching business that that didn't seem to have a lot of effect. And although the first few years we did have trouble hiring people, it did get better, and after Stout was fired in '57, we didn't have all that much problem. But the AAUP censureship did have some effect on who was there.

Stout was not one who liked any kind of criticism, and I do remember he did call a faculty meeting, I think it was after the board had made its decision to ask for his resignation. He did call a faculty meeting and made a kind of last-ditch effort to get faculty support for his staying, and had a couple of people in the audience planted to stand up and applaud at the end of his speech. And interestingly, they stood up alone, [chuckling] which doesn't very often happen, you know. But he didn't have any success in getting the faculty a movement to keep him around.

Well, except that the faculty really—I suspect that those who were actively opposing Stout were a distinct minority of the faculty. It

was not a unified faculty. That's part of what made it so ugly on the campus: it was faculty pitted against each other. And those tapes, I'm sure, of the hearing will reveal that there were more faculty witnesses called to support the board's position than to support Richardson. A number of faculty were called to testify that what Richardson did was an ethical error, and that he should not have distributed that pamphlet, and it was a serious attack and a subversive activity—a lot of that sort of thing.

Let's see, some names that had been mentioned as supporting Stout were Charles Hicks, Ruth Russell—

Yeah. Yes, I think she was one of those that he—she and Dean Mobley, and I'm not sure that Elaine was ever very strongly a supporter of Stout, but she was always fairly insecure in her job (she was dean of women), and when Stout said, "Go out and get me some evidence," she was willing to be on the committee. Higginbotham, I think, was on the committee, probably, that went out searching. Ira LaRivers in biology was one of those who supported Stout and was supported by Stout; his payoff was getting Richardson's chairmanship in the department. And Fred Ryser, who got Richardson's job, was also regarded as on the opposite side.

The deans sort of unwillingly were kind of dragged in in support of the president's position, but that didn't do very much positively about getting them on that side. I can't think who the others were who testified in opposition to Richardson. Nobody in English, and nobody, I think, in history, except Hicks would have been. Shepperson, I think, would not have been testifying in favor of Stout's position; I'd be pretty sure of that, nor would Driggs. I think maybe both of them might have testified, but it would have

been on the other side. And also testifying, but again in defense of Richardson, would have been Hume and Laird, and John Morrison in English, and Walter Clark in English, and Tom Little in biology. I think Don Cooney was there from biology; I think he got pulled in for some reason or other. There were not too many witnesses; there were a number, but not very many, and

The people who were testifying for Stout—were they testifying for Stout or against Richardson?

Oh, I would say almost exclusively for Stout, except insofar as maybe they might have got annoyed with Richardson just because he was forcing them to testify or something of that sort. But no, there was really not much faculty feeling against Richardson because the only charge that anyone could think of, which was a significant charge to some types of people, was that he was rocking the boat a little. And you don't want to do that; it may cause trouble. So that he did have some opposition on those general grounds. But the real irony of the board's picking Richardson to jump on is that he just didn't have any enemies. He was just an extremely accommodating, quiet, nice guy, and any of the rest of us would have been a better target than Richardson to focus on, but they didn't.

A couple of people that I have talked to were of the opinion that maybe not initially, but once he got the thing between his teeth, that he wanted to make waves, rock the boat and wouldn't let go of it?

No, I don't think that was it. Now, it is true that ultimately after he was fired, he did act at least partly just out of principle, and I suppose he could have got another job. He could've quietly slipped into the night, that kind of

thing. So if that's what's meant by hanging onto it, he did do that; that is, he did not simply say, "Yes, I've been a bad boy, and I've got another job, so I'm going of f." He did go through all the appeals machinery and so on.

But he wasn't doing—well, even a much more recent instance in which I again would disagree with what the board did was the Adamian case, which is much more recent. And in contrast, whereas I think Paul Adamian did not do anything deserving of dismissal at that Governor's Day business on the Vietnam thing (I think what he did there was, oh, maybe bad judgment, but certainly the recommendation for censuring that the committee produced was adequate punishment for what happened), so when the board went beyond that and fired him, I thought they were totally out of line.

But the point is this: that Adamian did—after the thing started—behave, I think, very badly in that he, Adamian, used students to work for him. He talked in his classes about his personal affairs. He took, I think, unethical advantage of his position to defend his personal case, so that for that I tended to condemn him, even though that was in a sense irrelevant to the decision that was made purely on the basis of that first—that one day's episode; he was not accused of anything else.

Well, my whole point is that Richardson did not do even that kind of thing. He was not eliciting student support; he was scrupulous about not going to his classes to talk about his personal affairs. And he could, of course, at various stages have simply dropped out and not pressed at all, but I think he couldn't have done it, really, except simply to take—which was an admission of guilt, and that he, I think, rightly didn't want to make. I certainly would have not made, and well, and did not make any admission of any kind of guilt. And I think

Frank was in the same spot. And that's what was hard for other AAUP people and so on to understand: he was not a troublemaker type, which is what you usually expect. He didn't like controversy, he didn't like confrontations, and [chuckling] was just trapped into it, really, and probably mostly because he was president of AAUP that year; that's probably what got him singled out as radical, because AAUP was always a kind of suspect organization in both Stout's eyes and the eyes of Si Ross, chairman of the Board of Regents. It smacked too much of organization or organized labor, something of that sort. They did not like it.

The effects on the University, you mentioned, I think I did comment just briefly, and I'll simply repeat it that I was amazed that the long-range effects were no greater than they turned out to be. I thought the splits and their recriminations and resentments would continue much longer than they did. And even those—you say you get echoes still of the feeling of people who remember and people who were unhappy about it—even though that's true, I think most of the wounds have more or less been healed. Partly, there aren't very many people left who were [chuckles] in much of it! But still it isn't a serious matter; I don't think there's anybody now who refused to speak to somebody else on the faculty because he was or was not pro-Stout. I don't. And that did happen, of course, in the fifties.

I was told that Brown and Higginbotham ended a very long-standing friendship over this.

Yeah, oh yeah, that's right. And inevitably so. There were several of those—[Harold N.] Brown—I think I mentioned that Brown was a particular target of Stout because Brown had taken over the deanship of Education when Traner retired. And Brown had been here a long time and was a very efficient administrator. Mrs.

Brown, Mabel, had taught for me, and we'd been good friends for a long time.

Mabel and I did a high school book together—two high school books, actually. And I remember that on the day the article came out, I rode home with Harold and Mabel from the office, and I had not seen this Bestor article that was the base of the controversy, and they were showing it to me. And I read passages of it, and I seem to remember we argued a little bit about some of them. And one of the things being charged was that teaching basic subjects like reading and writing were being neglected and that education schools were partly responsible. And Harold and I had always argued that, half jokingly, my saying that no, the standard stuff you can do friendly basis— my saying that the Education college was ruining education and exaggerating it more, and his saying, “What are you two people doing teaching English? Why don't you teach something that's substantial?” We did that on the way home, Harold and Mabel and I.

But a little bit later, Harold had real pressure put on him from Stout and from, I think, Fred Wood, dean of Arts and Science, who was after him also, that Harold must agree to testify that Stout had been attacked by this article of Richardson. You see, that was a kind of key testimony, if Stout was going to make the case that he was firing Richardson because Richardson had attacked him personally. That was ultimately the charge, that this article of Richardson's was a personal attack on the president, and therefore, was gross insubordination, or something of that sort. And in order to make that stick, there had to be people who would say that it was an attack and they so considered it, even though as it turned out, nobody paid any attention to what the charges or the evidence was anyway.

But Harold did refuse to do that, and then did on the stand quite specifically say that he did not feel he had been attacked by the article. And that cost him the deanship. And he simply was removed from the deanship, and they brought in a man from the outside, who became a very unsuccessful dean of the College of Education.

But Brown was a key figure in that sense. And the split between Brown and Higginbotham occurred because Higginbotham—well, in my opinion, selling out is almost literally the right term—he became zealous in behalf of the president in trying to collect evidence. And one of the things Higginbotham was told to deliver was Brown and his testimony that he had been criticized and attacked by the Richardson article. And when Brown refused, Higginbotham was in a bad place, so he was resentful. So I think they never did get back together. I don't know how close they were as friends, really. They'd known each other, of course, because they had both been here a long time, and I don't know that there anything terribly friendly there, but probably some things.

Melz in foreign languages also was—not fired, but he was one who was discriminated against on salary. It seemed to me that this [McHenry Report, “The University of Nevada: An Appraisal”] had some lists on what happened to salaries—maybe not.

I believe it does in Chapter 5.

I haven't looked at this for years. Oh, here's Salary Trends of Those Who Testified. Yeah, the pro-Richardson salaries were pretty clearly [chuckling] under the others!

Well, this [the report] was a fairly thorough job, and I think in a sense it almost leaned over backward to be fair, at least from the view of those of us who were there; it

looked as if it was fairer with Stout than it needed to be. They were very cautious about names, weren't they, which makes it less—it's interesting, that they were so careful, and I can see why—but at the same time it makes it much less interesting as a historical or much less useful as a historical document because you can't tie things down. It talks about the dean of the College of Education, but I can't remember when Brown was dropped.

They did come and talk to people and survey and—.

Oh yes. Yes, they did quite a thorough job. McHenry, as I remember, was on the campus most of the time for the whole affair. And I think all of 'em were here. I don't know how long they spent. I was thinking it was two or three weeks at least through there, looking around.

It was rather an unusual affair. Oh yeah, the survey team was a smaller group than the one right at the end. It was pretty much the group I remembered.

But it was not a particularly common thing for a legislature to—.

Oh, no, it was quite uncommon, and I think an interesting procedure. It [the report] doesn't really say how long they spent, but the team met first in January, 1956, adopted a schedule and assigned portfolios, then did fieldwork during the spring and summer months, and met again in September to draft reports and agree on recommendations. I guess that's what they did; they took pretty much the whole spring semester, and people worked at their own speed and not necessarily together as a committee (I'd forgotten that, but that's what they did). And then they had another group who did specific assignments

on disciplines and wrote individual, signed comments (I'd forgotten that), so that's the way it worked.

They must have come to you.

Oh yes. Yes, I'd talked with—well, it would have been McHenry and Lillard, mainly, that I talked to. And I don't remember the interviews at all now. I saw more of them than I would've normally since I mentioned to you I think, the irony that they did both happen to be old personal friends of mine, which I had nothing to do with [laughing] as far as their selection, but was very pleased by it! And oh yes, you're not the only one suspicious; obviously people were suspicious at the time, insofar as anybody knew that they were personal friends, although there wasn't any real reason they would have known—they were both pretty scrupulous about not making any point of the fact that we had been friends. And I don't know what difference it made in the end, since I think that the results would have been about the same, no matter what. Actually, I think the person with the strongest views was, as I recall, maybe Carlton Rodee from USC, whom I didn't know at all before. But I think he felt the injustice of the whole business more than even the other members of the committee. And it was a strange affair.

You mentioned, and I'm jumping back now to the beginning, that you couldn't think of any reason why Stout would have chosen you and Hume, and yet I notice in reading these reports that you were, I believe, all members of Faculty Welfare Committee and also the Academic Council that had been begun by Love and then Stout abolished.

That's right.

Would there have been a connection in that?

Oh, I think there was. But I think it is true that the immediate reason for including some of us was that Richardson did go to the Faculty Welfare Committee. The Faculty Welfare Committee then did go to Stout to try to smooth things out one way or another. And in that process we were obviously protesting the decision. The spokesmen for the Faculty Welfare Committee were normally Maurice Beesley, who was the chairman of it, and I, as sort of the secretary or vice chairman or something—it was all kind of a loose organization. But Beesley and I did do most of the talking with Stout in trying to resolve the thing with Richardson.

Beesley was a kind of protégé of Fred Wood, who was the dean of Arts and Science. And the gossip of the time was that Beesley was left off the list only because of Wood's intervention with Stout. I don't know anything about that, but that was the charge, and Beesley's never quite lived down that notion. I don't think Beesley would know whether it was true or not, but at least Beesley was not on the list, and the gossip always was that it was because Fred Wood had interceded in his behalf.

So that would explain part of it. I was also in the Administrative Council [Academic Council], and Stout didn't like that. And that would have accounted for part of it. And I suppose I shot my mouth off more than I should a lot of the time. I'd been on salary committees for AAUP. And so all of those things would have contributed to getting me on the list. But why the particular group were selected, and what the real fears or concerns of the people were, I still don't know. I think it was as much or more Silas Ross than it was Stout. And I think I told you that he [Stout] had, oh I think there were three-hour

interviews with each of Laird, Hume, and me the day after the hearings were called off. And the purpose of those was to resolve all differences, and at the end we were great buddies and shook hands, and I remember talking to Larry Laird just afterward, and we compared notes. Both of us thought we felt very sorry for this poor guy who just didn't know what the difficulties were and hadn't had enough experience in administration; we ought to try to help him and maybe we could smooth this whole business over. And then, of course, by the next day, it turned out that Richardson was not going to be included in this kind of arrangement, and also that there would be other ways of punishing us for whatever we had supposedly done. But we did, then, just concentrate on trying to push Richardson's case and didn't raise the rest of the problem.

It got complicated, too, because (this is changing the subject slightly; in a way it's all part of the same package) about that time we also had a proposal for an anti-Communist oath, which—I think that was Stout, although I can't remember the date, but it was another of those things in which the faculty got very much concerned and with some reason about having to sign an oath. And the oath was relatively harmless, but I think it did say, "I am not and have never been," or something like that, "a member..." And it was obviously intended to be used as a club.

Well, a lot of us protested, although that one I did not protest too loudly, since we had decided in advance that this was a ploy to try to get something on some people so that they could be dismissed later, and whether we were right or not about that strategy I don't know. But those of us who would have been expected to protest and would normally have protested—we did check, and nobody was embarrassed about signing an oath of

this sort. And we did in a faculty meeting get the oath watered down so that it wasn't too obnoxious (it was still discriminatory).

And then all of us were supposed to be the anti-Stout and the rebellious people, all of us just signed it without any protest or any comment at all, thinking we were being very smart in not giving them ammunition to raise a fuss again [chuckles]. And the problem is that it backfired, and three young psychologists, who were all pretty good, not only thought that we were terrible traitors to all principle and everything else, but refused to sign the thing and were fired. And then there wasn't any good way to protect 'em at that stage.

One thing that occurred to me, I don't know whether I mentioned at the very start, that when we got back from Saline Valley where we were when these registered letters were sent out, that when my wife and I—or maybe it was just I—came home from Bruce Thompson's that night, Ed Olsen, who was the Associated Press reporter at the time, and Bryn Armstrong, who worked for either the Journal or Gazette, were waiting for us (or waiting for me, at least). And what they told us—and I've always been grateful for their honesty—was that their assignment was to get us to release the contents of that letter. And the letter dismissing us, the registered letter which we couldn't get, had been deposited in the newspaper office several days in advance. And the assignment of these two was to go out and get us to release the letter so that it would look as if we had released it rather than as if it had been planted. And Bryn and Ed were—I didn't know them very well—but they were just honest and decent enough to come out and say that was their assignment, but to point out that we were crazy if we gave them that permission, so that the story couldn't break until after they could pretend at least that the letters had been delivered.

But the newspaper had a copy, which was part of the sort of the "old boy" cronyism that was running the whole state, with the responsibility sort of divided up, and Joe McDonald, who ran the paper and who was a fraternity buddy and so on of Si Ross, being sort of in on the whole business. And it was part of the way in which things were done. And again, you know, this was not regarded by any of them, I'm sure, as conspiratorial or unethical or improper; this was just confidence in all these good buddies and people who know how to do things, and "we'll just have to work together to straighten the University out."

And I'm sure that probably even honestly, that was most of the motive. I don't think anybody had any personal gains that were possible; I don't think anybody had any personal antagonism toward any of us, unless [chuckling] as I suggested, Ross was miffed by that undertaker bit, which may have been true. But except for that, I have no notion why it did go on. Although it is true, basically, that the five of us along with some others had, I think, advocated and had made some changes in the faculty; that is, all of us believed that faculty members ought to be doing some research as well as teaching. All of us had been active in something other than our straight teaching. All of us believed that the faculty should have something to say about the way a university was run. So that in a sense there was really a philosophical difference, which may have been behind it, although Stout professed many of these sane general ideas himself. And that's partly what leads to the guess that it was Ross who was worried about the fact that the faculty might get too big for its britches or something of that sort.

Ross, again, had taught a little bit, but he never finished a degree, I think, and therefore was not rehired for a long time. And I think

that tended to develop some anti-intellectual prejudices, maybe, I don't know. He may have—that's all speculation—haven't any real notion what it was about.

President Love had made advances in allowing more faculty self-governance. And then there are the rumors that Love was not fired, but urged to go elsewhere, because of problems with the regents. And then, in comes Stout, who as I understand it, was pretty much just hand-picked by Silas Ross.

Yeah. No, you're quite right—there was certainly some of that, and that it may have been with Ross—. Well, I think I told you my introduction to the campus was a faculty meeting in which Ross (this was while Moseley was president)—in which Ross did point out that the faculty's business was to teach, and this was a phrase that Stout used often afterward—"sticking to your area" was Stout's phrase. And Ross had—I don't think he used that phrase, but it was the same notion that teachers were supposed to teach; they were not to mess with things like politics; they were not to be talking to people downtown about policies of the University. Their job was to do what they were told to do. And as I told you, I was shocked, but I think that was Ross's basic notion, and it is true that under Love we had got some salaries up, the AAUP had been active (although they started under Moseley), and Moseley was not opposed to—Moseley was not tyrannical in his views. But I think it's quite possible that Ross simply figured, and maybe quite honestly, that the faculty was getting out of hand and that too many faculty members were getting too much said or getting too much power or feeling their oats too much or being too cocky, and they had to be punished—had to be shown, and had to have some examples. I think it may have

been something like that that was behind it. At least that's as plausible as any explanation I can think of.

And it is true that Fred Wood, the dean, who was, I think, trying to be helpful, I think genuinely liked Laird and flume and me—particularly flume; he'd been very fond of flume. Wood regarded flume as his great find, that he had hired him and brought him out here, and flume had become a very popular teacher, and Wood always thought of him as sort of a protégé. And so I think Wood was generally genuinely trying to help us, but the only way he knew to help us was to try to talk us into doing exactly what Stout wanted, which was to admit that we were wrong and promise never to say anything again, in effect is what [chuckling] it amounted to. And except for that, Wood simply could not bring himself to take sides against the president; it was just a matter of his tradition and training and background.

But Wood did advise us in various ways. Oh, I remember his saying to me at one time, he thought, well, maybe I'd become too influential too fast, maybe. Maybe he'd moved me too fast. Well, he wasn't, talking about promotions or salary because I had not moved very fast there, but it is true that I was on a lot of committees and was chairman of the department doing a lot of administrative types of things, fairly early. Especially, I was doing a lot of helping Wood on committees and in various other capacities. But it was a strange, strange business.

What would you say the whole thing really was about? What was the real issue?

Well, ultimately, the real issue was academic freedom, I think. The real issue was whether Frank Richardson or anybody else had a right to disagree, more or less

publicly, with his superior. Now that isn't, quite the way it came out; that's a tremendous oversimplification, but I think that was really the issue. And it was decided pretty much on the basis of that kind of issue. There were all sorts of other things going on at the same time, all the way from little petty power plays to fairly significant side issues, like bribery with salaries or punishment with salaries and things like that. But it was essentially, I think, just a question of to what extent a university can be or should be run pretty much tyrannically. And I'm not sure that it was even Stout's tyranny that was there; I'm reasonably sure that Stout was brought in with orders to clean this place up. He had to get the place straightened around. I think there's no doubt that that was part of what was there, and that Ross was looking for a strong man who could come in and do that kind of thing. But I think Ross must have felt honestly that the place needed some cleaning up, that it had all these young radicals in there who were suggesting that the faculty ought to have some say. They were writing books; they were one of the charges that Stout specifically made to both Laird and me was that we wrote books, and oh, yes, that was specifically stated. I don't remember too much of this interview—I remember one thing, he spent a lot of time on an article in *Fortune* magazine, in which he discussed the fact that in business (and to him the University was a good deal like business)—discussed the fact that in business the people were responsible for their wives, and he made a great point that he liked Johnnie Belle, who was my first wife. And he made a great point of telling me that she was fine, that she wasn't like Helen Wittenberg. As a matter of fact, he just didn't know that they were working together [laughing] pretty closely. But she was fine, and I was not being penalized because of anything my wife did.

But he then did go on with both Laird and me, had to say that part of what people resented was that we had been writing books, that might give us some kind of—make us different in some ways from some of the other faculty who didn't., and therefore we would be resented for this, and that was one of the things we needed to think about. And so [laughing] a lot of it, as I think of details, it's almost unbelievable some of the sorts of things that—.

I can't really remember much of those interviews that we had with Stout, except that they went on a long time, and that I think what we were trying to do (these were all individual, so I don't really know, except from comparing notes afterward, what happened in Laird's and Rune's and Little's interviews)—but a lot what we were trying to do was to find out why Stout really had sent those letters, what it was all about. And all three of us came to the conclusion that Stout really didn't quite know. That was when we developed the assumption, at least, that it was Si Ross who had told him what to do. And this was confirmed because during the interviews Stout did tell us that everything was fine and that we would be reinstated, there'd be no problems at all, and so on.

Well, he did have to call back the next day to explain that in consultation with the chairman of the Board of Regents, this would have to be deferred and there'd have to be some concessions, some differences made, so that the deals—. And this is part of what was maddening. Again, I don't think this was Stout being clever and subtle, that he made the deal and then backed off just a little, and then off just a little more, and then a little more, so that ultimately we found ourselves just sucked in step by step to agreeing to cut the salaries, to do this, do that. And we were never told that he—the implication or the impression we got

was that all five were getting the same kind of arrangement; we did not know until it was too late to do much about it, that Richardson was not being included, that they were going to make a fall guy out of Richardson. All of that was just revealed step by step, and we were just sort of naively sucked in one stage after another to what was happening.

In some ways I regret that; I don't know, maybe still in retrospect it was the smart thing to do, but I think maybe the more honest thing to do would have been to reject everything unless we got it in writing, and stick with the supreme court protection, for whatever that was worth, although it would have meant probably that we'd have forced the board to fire us, but maybe it would have been a more honest thing to do, I don't know. We've thought about that one often afterward.

What was Stout's attitude in these conferences? I read about an interview with Richardson in which he was really insulting and harsh and shouting.

He was capable of that. In the interviews with us he was almost apologetic, very friendly. We all left the interviews saying in our naiveté that we felt sorry for Stout, that he'd got pushed into things, that maybe we could help him out of this—that kind of business. This view lasted about twenty minutes, I suppose, but at the time he gave this impression that he was terribly sorry about this, that there'd just been this terrible mistake, that they just sort of thoughtlessly fired us. You know, it was kind of absurd, but still it was a very conciliatory business. And I'd hear him yelling at Richardson and some others, too, and even with the Faculty Welfare Committee, that he was going to fire Richardson, if Richardson didn't straighten around. (That was early on before the

dismissals, when we could not convince him that Richardson was not attacking him.) I am not enough of an amateur psychiatrist to analyze Stout, but I'm sure there were some things that a psychologist could label that—maybe paranoia of some sort is one of them.

But those interviews were very friendly and totally conciliatory and apologetic and it was all, "How can we work together? We've had this bad scene, but let's all get together now and do it." And he undoubtedly was exceeding his authority because Ross apparently backed him down as soon as he went back to Ross. And I think if we had not gone to the supreme court that we would just have been fired like that. Because well, even Stout, I remember his making a speech at one time, which shocked the faculty a little, in which he gave a definition of tenure, that tenure is a privilege conferred by the president on a faculty member which can be revoked at any time—, [laughing] which is a strange, strange definition of tenure! And that was an announcement at a faculty meeting sometime along during the year.

The whole tenure business was sort of obscure at the time, anyway. And it did turn out that all five of us had tenure, but it was not very clearly identified what tenure meant or anything of that sort. And part of what the supreme court and other decisions did was define, explain at least what our view or our definition of tenure was, insofar as they could identify it. And I had a very peculiar kind of tenure: I had written the dean asking about tenure when I was hired, not expecting to be granted tenure; I didn't have any tenure at Indiana before I came here. And I got a letter back from the dean, which is still in my safe deposit box, I think, saying, "On your appointment as an assistant professor, you will have tenure at the University of Nevada." But I've never heard of another one like that.

But apparently, since I inquired, that was the solution. And it seemed to stick—[laughing] I don't know!

And that's how you have tenure?

Urn-bin. That's still how I have tenure! Well, that's plus the supreme court guarantees now. But at the time that was it, that letter from the dean, which I'm sure would stand up in court. And I don't know of anybody else who has such a letter, probably because nobody else ever bothered to inquire [laughs], but I don't know.

[You mentioned that your wife and Helen Wittenberg had been working together. Was this Friends of the University, or was this through the PTA? I've been told that the PTA became for some reason very involved in this whole thing.]

No, Johnnie Belle had nothing to do with the PTA. She and Helen worked together largely through League of Women Voters. And they were not directly involved with University things, but that was part of what Stout had in mind when he referred to Helen. He was annoyed with Helen Wittenberg mostly, of course, because she was bugging the University by discovering information and facts which were embarrassing to them. But what I referred to was simply that Johnnie Belle was also active in women's organizations like Helen, and that they were friends. And there were a number of other women working through the Friends of the University. As far as I can remember, the Friends of the University were not very closely connected with PTA on this, although there may have been some—I just don't remember that.

But I don't know why I can't think of more of the people who were involved with the Friends of the University—Helen Wittenberg and Ralph, and Miriam and John Chism

were. By Harris, professor of—that's another interesting one—Everett Harris, who was professor of engineering, and an old Nevada family. And Ev used to stop in my office, and my office was down in the temporary buildings at the time. And Ev used to stop in my office every day and check it thoroughly for bugs. This always seemed to me a kind of joke, but he was sure that my office was wired with a direct line to Stout's office. And so he'd come in [laugh ing] and check all through every morning! And we did, of course, have some reason to think that everything we said was immediately transmitted to the president, and it probably was. There always are people, you know, who without even being vicious about it, just liked to buzz about whatever is going on.

And Stout did bring in a friend one time, too, to be a member of the English department. The guy was supposed to become chairman of the department; it turned out he was terrible. (What in the world was his name? He also was "moved to Siberia." Brink—Lauren Brink.) And Lauren was brought in, I think, the year I was in Australia, without any consultation with the department, which is a terrible thing to do to anybody, you know, to bring somebody into a department as an appointee of an unpopular president over the protests of the department. So poor Brink didn't have a chance after he got here, and he didn't stay very long. I really didn't know him much. And I think he became ill when he was in Las Vegas. I just don't remember much about him. But Stout did things like that.

At one stage, also, he appointed—well, William Ransome Wood was brought out as a vice president by Stout, partly with a notion of straightening things out internally with the faculty, and so on. And Bill Wood did have a Ph.D. in English, presumably, so Stout, partly because he thought that the problems of the

faculty focused in the English department, which maybe they did, thought one solution would be to make Bill wood chairman of the English department. And so Bill was made chairman, and this was a kind of a rather unpleasant joke in the department. Bill didn't have time to do anything about it, for- one thing, and he was totally incompetent to do anything about it, for another.

So we would go on running the department as we had, and doing it sort of cooperatively without any really nominated head, except that when things had to be done, we got a secretary to take 'em up to Bill to be sighed, which he always did. And then he would come down and appoint committees just all over the place to do all kinds of things: "We're going to revise the curriculum here and work this out—" And he would appoint a dozen or so committees, and everybody would very calmly accept the appointments, and then, of course, do nothing about it. And by the time Bill came around for another meeting, he would have forgotten all about this, and [laughing] nothing would happen. And with the younger ones, particularly, he was always getting in trouble because he'd put Milton in the wrong century, or he'd get—you know, he hadn't thought about English since he took his degree, but any little slip like that, of course, people were ready to jump on and make something of.

But Bill did stay nominally chairman for the department for, I think, about a year. And I don't remember how that chairmanship juggled around. I guess when I came back from Australia—no, I was gone somewhere else, I guess. Anyway, I did, because the department thought it would be a slap against Stout—did agree to be chairman again for a year or so. And Stout wasn't in any position to turn it down. But I can't remember what that was.

I can't locate Wood. I can't locate his years, really, in the whole business. He stayed on after Stout and ran very actively to be named president when Stout was tired. And that was a kind of touch-and-go thing with the Board of Regents because he had no real support on the faculty, but he did have a few people that were sort of pushing, and he also was interested in trying to work with the Board of Regents to get the appointment as president. And this was again a kind of divisive faculty affair with a lot of the Stout supporters pushing Wood to be president, and a lot of others not. And my memory is that he lost the appointment by only one vote on the board, something like that, or two. But the board did turn him down as president—he may have been acting president for a year, even—I'm not sure.

I think he was. That's right, I think he was acting president for a year, and then wanted to become the regular president, but didn't really—. He left and was very successful, apparently, in some ways at least, as president of the University of Alaska, where he retired only three or four years ago. And I hear mixed reports of his success there, but I think in general he—at least he was there a long time, very—. And so it was apparently successful. We did not get along on a totally amicable basis, although we never had any real run-ins, but I think he never trusted me completely, and I guess I never trusted him! [Laughs] It was probably fair. But he was, and he did fit into part of it. And I think maybe he had something to do with that Jacobson business that I'm having troubles with remembering. But I think that may have been part of it.

We've spent a lot of time talking about Stout and the Richardson affair; of course, that was probably the major aspect of his administration, but on the whole, how would you assess his, what, five years as president?

In many ways, he did the University some good. For example, it was a time when he could—and he was successful—in increasing the appropriations from the legislature. He managed to get salary scales up at least for some people, but in the end it meant that they were up generally. He probably didn't set the—this is' a kind of paradox, that it's possible that just because he focused the kind of opposition that was against him, which ultimately became the major trend of the University, although not during his regime—but I think that by focusing that opposition, he did perhaps hasten the movement of the University faculty toward more independence and toward more research and more general scholarly attitudes than had prevailed earlier. I don't think that was his purpose necessarily, although he would have said that he wanted this done. That was part of the contrast—again a kind of paradox—that Stout probably would have said at one moment that what he wanted faculty members to do was write books and do scholarly things, even though at another moment he would have told both Laird and me that writing books was one of the reasons we were being fired. He might not have seen those even as inconsistent positions; I don't know. But in any event he did—whether it was at his instigation or in spite of him—I think did preside over a kind of revolution or the beginnings of a kind of revolution in the faculty, which were starting to turn the University into a university. Part of this came about just because he was presiding at a time of inevitable growth. This was the postwar period, and when I came here, we had a great boom the fall of 1945 and went up to something like nine hundred students. Now I don't know what the movements in enrollment were after that, but during Stout's years there were considerable increases.

Stout also had a good deal to do with developing UNLV, which again was one of those ironic things. I don't know whether I mentioned before or not, but UNLV technically got its start just before Stout came. There'd, been a lot of activity in Las Vegas, a lot of interest in some kind of secondary education. Places like USC and Northern Arizona were moving in a lot of extension work and so on. Maude Frazier, who was a representative in the assembly from Las Vegas and a former teacher, was much interested in education, who was a powerful and very talented woman. And it became apparent that if the University didn't do something about some post-secondary education for Las Vegas, some things that might not be good for the whole state would happen.

So in the spring—it must have been of '51, maybe (maybe '52—Stout came in the fall of '52, didn't he?)—so it probably was the spring of '52, Harold Brown, whom I had mentioned, who was dean of Education, and I were commissioned by the Administrative Council, of which Fred Wood, the dean, was chairman, were commissioned to go down to Las Vegas and start a university [laughing] in effect! And along in—it must have been the fall of '51 if Stout came in the fall of '52, because Harold and I drove a University car down there, and we took along some registration blanks and some contract forms and Jim Dickinson. And Jim was an instructor in English, who had not finished his Ph.D. And we bribed Jim—he was coming up against a tenure-or-out arrangement—so we bribed Jim to go down to Las Vegas if we would extend his time for his Ph.D. by three years!

And so Harold and Jim and I went down there. We scouted around, and we hired a part-time foreign languages teacher and a part-time science teacher, and Jim was going to teach English; and we rented a couple of

rooms in the high school; and we registered twenty students, and wrote press releases for every day for the next week, and went to see Maude Frazier to get her support and went to see some other people—the regents down there, and spent five days down there and said, “Goodbye, Jim, have fun!” and came back to Reno. [Laughing] And that was really the start of UNLV.

Well, the next fall, then, it must have been, or maybe the next spring, I got a call from Fred Wood one day, who was dean of Arts and Science, remember—got a call from Fred Wood, and he just said, “Say, I think you ought to know, for next fall you need to keep a place on staff open for Jim Dickinson because the president’s just told me he’s going to close the Las Vegas branch.”

And I said, “Oh, fine,” and hung up, and then suddenly did a double take! [Laughing] “What in the world is he doing?” And I think Laird was in the office at the time, and I mentioned it to him, and he threw up his hands, too. And I immediately got Wood back and said, “Look, does he know what he’s doing, what this will do politically to the budget, and that kind of thing?” He had the legislature coming up.

And Wood said, “Well, I don’t know. Maybe I better talk to him about it.”

And I said, “I think you better!”

And so Wood aid talk to Stout about it, and Stout then immediately saw the possibilities of making something out of the UNLV proposal. This may have been even a year— it must have been a year after—it must have been ’54 or something when Stout decided to close it. Yeah, that must be right, because it would have had to have time to develop a little.

And Stout earlier had called me, taking great exception to a story he’d seen that Dickinson had written for the papers. The

Las Vegas papers had carried a story in which Dickinson had said that the UNLV—or the University of Nevada southern branch, it was then, or the branch of the University in southern Nevada—was primarily a streetcar university, and therefore there were some special problems, and they didn’t need dormitories and so on. And Stout called me all upset, “What does he mean calling this a streetcar university? We’ve got to do something about this fellow.”

That was one of the various times when Stout did lose his temper, and it turned out Stout didn’t have the vaguest notion what a streetcar university meant. He thought it was something derogatory, and of course, all he meant was that they were all kids who lived in Las Vegas who were coming out there. And so I finally calmed Stout down on that. But apparently he never got over disliking Dickinson for that reason, and for that reason—or others—was going to close it.

Well, as soon as Wood talked to him, Stout saw the possibilities and immediately did a reversal and started promising Las Vegas everything, and as a result, did, I think, do what turned out to be very good ultimately for Las Vegas, in that he moved them faster toward becoming an autonomous institution than they would have otherwise. He saw a possibility there of strengthening his political hold on the job. And he did hasten the development of the UNLV campus, and probably for the good. But he was going to close it. He tended to do things impulsively like that without really checking much.

That [UNLV] was something he accomplished in a way. He was a curious fellow, and I’ve never—. I think he left here and took a job with Curtiss-Wright Company at a very high salary (at least high in those days and high in comparison to what he was making here), the rumor being that he was

to handle some personnel matters that were uncomfortable. He was there only about a year, and then he got a job at the University of Miami in Coral Gables, Florida.

And there I did get some reports: he apparently got the job as an officer of development, and he apparently got the job on the strength of alleging connections with the Fleischmann Foundation, which would allow him to raise a lot of money. And the story I got obviously from not totally objective sources, from a friend of mine on the faculty there—he left there in about a year or two—and the story I got was that he managed to do nothing but build up a fancy office, and he never raised a dime, and therefore, they let him go.

And he then went to the U.S. Office of Education, where he took a job and was there for several years, and then became a professor of education at Arizona State University in Tempe, and as far as I know, is still there—surely retired, I don't know. But Jim Hulse talked to him at the time he was writing the history, and he was there then and was active then. But I don't know.

He left a lot of hard feelings, morale problems. On the other hand, if you were to make a judgment, would you say he did more harm than good?

Oh, yeah, I'd say he did more harm than good. I would say that. And I would base that on the fact that I think a lot of good was done, but that much of the good was done in spite of him rather than because of any positive influences he had. No, I would say that on the whole Stout's contribution was basically negative to the institution, but that the institution did make progress during the time, which is, I think a comment that should make any administrator a little humble; that

is, I think it's pretty hard to ruin an institution. [Chuckling] And if anybody could do it, Stout could have, but I don't think he could. And just as I don't think any administrator can make it successful either. And it [chuckles]—and it takes more than that. And on the whole, what happened during Stout's presidency, I think occurred in spite of really severe handicaps he put there.

You can play all around with ideas like this, of course, and it's even possible that one of the ways you get progress is by needling people. To a certain extent, Stout, I think, believed this. He did get some success by badgering people into it. And I don't think he was subtle enough to do this significantly, but certainly I have known teachers who produced very good students just because they did it out of resentment against the teacher; they were going to show him that they could do better. And that's a technique that sometimes works. I doubt that it ever works when it's intentional, but occasionally you do get a teacher who's quite successful, even though by most standards he's a bad teacher. But he does somehow or other provoke students into [laughing]—into doing things that they might not do if he were better and made things easier for them. And I could name a few of those here, but I won't.

Well, let's see. I was thinking of one other anecdote today, and I cannot remember whether I mentioned it before. This is way back at the end of the Stout thing. I thought of it on the way in today, and I think I probably thought of it months ago when we were doing this before. But it was kind of a funny story, and I was reminded of it because I saw John Morrison the other day. Sometime after the whole Stout business was over, Morrison and various others of us were at a party someplace or other, and Si Ross was there. And John was being friendly and conciliatory, just saying,

well, he hoped now everything was over, everything could be worked out all right. And he thought we had to heal the wounds and that kind of business. And Ross was again very cordial; he'd certainly like to talk to anybody who talked to him. He'd like to talk to John Morrison; if John would just call, he would like to get together with him. They could get everything straightened out.

And so John took it very seriously and went back to the office. And the next day, Monday morning or whenever it was, he called Si and got an appointment for Wednesday afternoon or something. Well, there was tremendous excitement all over the department. John talked to everybody. "Now what questions do you want me to ask? What do you want me to find out about it?" And so he had a long list of things he was going to get straightened out with Si: why he had started all this business in the first place; and what he was worried about in the English department and the rest of the University; why he was so upset. And he had this all worked out, and everybody was sitting around waiting. And John got all dressed up on the Wednesday afternoon, went down to the mortuary and got there five minutes early at five minutes 'till one. And Si met him very cordially, and they sat down and did little pleasantries. And John kept fingering his list, waiting to do it, and he'd make little gestures about, "Well, now... University..."

And Si, "Yes, but there are a couple of things. I think you would like to see a little of what goes on here." And so he started out with a little speech about how when he was in Tonopah, he had (was it Tonopah or Goldfield?—I forget) seen as a young man the way some of these people were buried without proper ceremony and without any real consideration for the families or for the way they looked, and he had vowed then

that he was going to see if he couldn't do something for our society so that people would go off into the other world in better style. And it went on from there and moved into a tour of the mortuary, including a look at all the different kinds of caskets and the prices and so on, look at the rest of it; and two hours later, after having walked through the mortuary and heard longer and longer discussions of the mortician's business and why Si had decided to reform it [laughing], Si said, "It was nice to see you, Dr. Morrison, goodbye!" [Laughing]

And John, with his list still in his pocket, went back to the office! And that was a kind of total anticlimax to the whole Stout affair. And I don't know whether I mentioned that before or not. I thought I would—partly when Morrison and I were talking about something the other day, and he remembered it [chuckling].

One of the—this is way off the subject—but one thing that I'm reminded of in connection with Stout, about the time—well, I guess it was the first year Stout was here, he identified himself one time, sort of publicly, saying that when he was on the stand at the hearing of the Board of Regents, he felt exactly like Captain Queeg in the *Came Mutiny Court-Martial*, which he had seen in the movies, and he thought this was exactly the position he was in. He was being maligned and being pressed in this way. And about—oh, about two months after that, I ended up playing the part of Captain Queeg in the Reno Little Theater production! [Laughs] And I got teased enough about playing Stout's role, I got to half thinking maybe I was playing Minard Stout some of the time [laughing] when it was going on. But it was a fun play, and I don't know whether Stout ever saw it or not, but it was there.

THE UNIVERSITY IN THE 1960S

We were talking about the end of the Stout administration, which I guess I don't remember anything very significant about. Stout made, I remember, one sort of last gasp to stay on. He called a faculty meeting and was quite emotional about what he had done and how he had worked for the University, and sort of fixed it so that it would have been natural for somebody to move that he stay on or—a rising ovation or something of that sort, but it didn't happen. And so he did leave, and William Ransom Wood, who had been his vice president, stayed on for a year as acting president.

Wood was pleasant enough and I don't think vindictive in the way that Stout was. I think I mentioned that he'd not made any great reputation for his scholarly background with the English department, at least, and he was very closely identified with Stout. He had made, though, a few very good friends on the campus, and there was a lot of maneuvering among faculty and on the Board of Regents to try to keep Wood on. How much of that Wood had anything to do with I don't know. But

there were curious things: I was approached quite seriously by a faculty member who said that he had Wood's agreement (I don't know that he did) —he had Wood's agreement that if I would try to get a couple of friends of mine on the board to support Wood for the presidency, he would make me vice president and would then resign after a year or two. And [chuckling] even, as I remember, offered to get me this in writing! Strange kind of business. And whether it had any validity or not, I've never known. In any event, I was not eager to be either president or vice president, and so indicated.

But that's typical of the kinds of manipulation that were going on. Apparently, there were attempts to influence regents' votes in favor of Wood and so on. I remember on the day of the vote, actually, I was at a faculty party, and bets were being taken on whether Wood would be [chuckling]— would be retained or not. And the odds were pretty close, as I recall. And a couple of people at that party who thought they were very much in the know were confident that Wood was

going to be named president, and anyway, he was not. And [Charles J.] Charlie Armstrong was brought in.

I don't remember a thing about the selection of Armstrong. There were a number of candidates, I think, including Wood, of course. And I think including Dean McHenry, who had been the chairman of the committee investigating Stout. I can't remember whether McHenry was really—I think, McHenry declined to be a candidate, ultimately, but I'm not sure of that.

Anyway, Armstrong did come; he'd been at Whitman College, as I recall, and he'd been president of a little college up near Portland in Forest Grove called Pacific University, I believe is the name of it. I had met him up there; I'd been on the accreditation committee that had accredited the University a couple of years before, but I didn't really know him. And he did come down, had a much different background from the presidents we'd had more recently. He had a Harvard Ph.D., and he was a scholar in the classics and was interested in academic matters, primarily, and was, I think, quite a good president. But he was never terribly palsy with the members of the faculty and was criticized to some extent for that. He tended to get along well enough with the faculty administration, but he did tend to work fairly closely with the Board of Regents and also with the downtown businessmen, and people sometimes felt that he was being too close to the people downtown and not paying enough attention to people on the campus.

I don't know whether Charlie was a popular president or not; it'd be hard—I suppose one would say he was not terribly popular. But I thought he was very good, and in general, I think he was quite a successful president. It was a kind of boom time in

university business so that there were not a lot of crises developing. That is, it was a time of expansion; it was a time of increased federal money; it was a time of growth in the faculty.

And also it was a time in which the sorts of things that had been pushed back during the Stout period were being rebuilt. And there was a new plan for establishing the faculty senate. Maurice Beesley, as I remember, was chairman of that committee. I can't remember when the new senate was established, but during Stout, you see, there had been no faculty meetings, even. I think Stout referred to faculty meetings as a "wailing wall," to my memory. And he thought it was all right for the faculty to get together once in a while, as long as they didn't do anything—. But there were plans for a faculty senate established, and these messed around for a long, long time before they finally got solidified and adopted. But the senate was started.

The University Code—I can't remember when that—well, you've got a date here that it was 1959. And that is interesting. I can't remember how that first code was established. That code was worked on when Wood was president—I'm remembering now. There was a committee; there were four faculty members (I can't remember who they were) —I was one of them. And I do remember hours and hours of arguing with Wood.

One of the problems, I remember, was that he wanted to set up everything and preface every statement with something like "normally" or "usually"—anyway, there was a qualifier on everything. Everything was made fairly strict, but it had a "normally" in front of it so that it was very hard to tell what was really going on. And we argued a long time about that and argued also over whether there should be any faculty review committees

on promotion and tenure and so on, which Wood did oppose, and which some of us, at least, on the faculty thought should be there. And it wasn't a direct faculty-administration confrontation; there were divisions on both sides.

But that was a very slow process, and that did, though, I think, produce ultimately this first University Code, which was not too bad a document, I think, and which remained in effect for quite a long time. It was subject to revision from time to time, and soon after—well, sometime during the sixties, we started another code procedure, and I seemed to have been on a code committee almost interminably, one year after another. I remember Chuck Breese and I were trying to figure out the other day how often, or how long we had been on various code committees, and it did seem forever rewriting these things.

The code—this is getting way out of chronological order, but the code did remain a part of the UNR system, and then as UNLV developed and became UNLV rather than Nevada Southern, I think a code was developed down there, but about the time they were working on a code, it became obvious that there needed to be a systemwide code, and the code—the UNR code applied to both campuses, I think, for a while. But ultimately, especially after the division of the two and the establishment of the statewide system and the chancellorship, which occurred sometime during Armstrong's regime— well, after that, there had to be a system code. And that went on interminably. I was chairman of the UNR committee, and there were several chairmen from UNLV, and we worked with Neil Humphrey, the chancellor, on it. And Don Fowler from DRI also worked on it. And the three of us spent a lot of time arguing back and forth.

But then ultimately it had to go the Board of Regents. And I guess before we argued with Humphrey, it had to go to the Board of Regents, and I spent a lot of regents' meetings arguing about details of the code. Part of the problem was we still had some of the residue of the, not so much McCarthy period, but the Vietnam times. We still had a lot of residue of that, and some members of the Board of Regents wanted to set up very elaborate disciplinary procedures for faculty. I don't know how many hours we spent on this: on the phrase "moral turpitude," for example, with me for the committee urging that "moral turpitude" not be used, and the regents insisting that we had to have a phrase that you could be dismissed for "moral turpitude," whatever that may be.

And some of those meetings were rather fun, even though they got fairly loud sometimes. I used to get baited quite a lot by Mel Steninger and Bill Morris, but we got along very well because I would yell back and we would be friendly afterward. And it really worked fairly well.

But we did finally get something that the board and the committee and the chancellor agreed on, and got a system code—I don't know when. Seems to me there was a code dated 1968, but—. And I think there was one. And that was the beginning of a long series of revisions and arguments and continuing code committees and changes in the length.

But it is true that the University for quite a while, I think, has been ahead of many institutions as far as faculty governance and faculty participation in governance is concerned, and that on the whole it's been pretty sensible, and it has worked pretty well. Charlie Armstrong was in favor of faculty governance and did rely on it—not to the same extent that some presidents since have,

but certainly more than, and more honestly and sensibly than the presidents who had preceded.

Well, I notice you've got some other people on the outline.* I mentioned Neil Humphrey earlier in connection with Mordy, I think, and the conflict that they had going for a long time. I liked Neil always. But he was University controller and then did become a candidate along with Mordy and I think Dale Bohmont for the chancellorship, and he did come out as the winner in that sort of bitter undercover battle— nothing on the surface, but quite a lot of maneuvering going on behind the scenes.

And Neil probably did as well in that chancellorship as anyone could have under the circumstances. He was subject to constant griping and objection, which I think was just the nature of the beast; I think there was no way to avoid being in constantly difficult spots there. The faculty felt that the chancellor's office was holding things up always and preventing progress and this kind of thing. The presidents had trouble with the chancellor's office. Neil managed to make it work, I think, because nobody ever questioned his integrity or his ultimately good purpose. Nobody ever questioned any of that; they questioned his judgment almost every hour and certainly questioned his decisions. And he didn't have much educational imagination; he primarily was an accountant. And he did get along well with the legislature, did produce clear and accurate budgets, which his successor [Don Baepler] has not managed to do. And so on the whole, he was a very successful person. He had some troubles dealing with personnel in that although they respected him, they frequently disagreed with him, and Neil did not really like open disagreement very well, and a few people got into some troubles with him that way.

You've got [N.] Edd Miller on the list. I just had a note from Edd. He was, as you probably know, very popular as a president with the students, semi-popular with the faculty, semi-popular with the Board of Regents. He operated almost passively a lot of the time and I think successfully so. He, I think, had trouble getting decisions made; a lot of things stayed on his desk a long time. He'd get here at five in the morning almost every morning, and I know why— that was the time he could do something before the phones started ringing. And so he did get his work done early in the morning usually, and then spend the rest of the day on the phone. He was a very accommodating president and a very likable president. And he was objected to largely both because he did tend to put off decisions, and also because he had some trouble making hard decisions when they were hard in the sense of maybe possibly hurting somebody in the process. He was a very kind man and just didn't like to make any decision that was going to make somebody unhappy, and consequently, didn't do it a lot of the time. That isn't true always. He was much in favor of the Medical School, I think, and had a good deal to do with getting that funded and arranged.

*Did he just sit on things until they went away?
What was his method of—?*

Oh no, I'm exaggerating that, too, I suppose. But he did a lot of the time just sit on things that needed changing, but sometimes it was a very good idea; it was the best way to handle it. But it did tend to annoy faculty from time to time. Of course, that's a favorite complaint of the faculty with

*Prepared outline for interview.

any president, and it's true in many instances. Although it's not always just a matter of neglect or carelessness; it may very well be that the president just thinks it's better not to make a decision now, and just to let it drag, and frequently I think that is a good way to operate—on certain issues, not all the time. Edd probably didn't do too much of it.

A couple of things occurred. One of them was a kind of—oh, I suppose maybe overly sentimental in some ways—Edd Miller Day that the students put together, and so far as I know, the students put it together pretty much themselves with their own motivation. That's the kind of thing that people always are suspecting that somebody put 'em up to it. But what they did was meet him—a bunch of students when he first came to the campus—and had a small parade or something around with him, and then went home and got Nena, his wife, and took the two of 'em to the airport and put em on a plane for San Francisco for a paid vacation for two or three days [laughing]. But they had signs all over, "N. Edd Miller Day," and it was, in some ways, a kind of interesting ploy for some national publicity because it was the time in which administrations were being castigated all over, and this, you see, got the University some national publicity; the difference of the students in Nevada from the students all over; here they have a president they respect. And so they did get some good press out of it.

And he also got pretty nearly fired by the board a time or two. On one occasion, I remember—this was—oh, I can't remember what year, but I do remember that there was a faculty meeting (I can't remember who called it). But anyway, a half a dozen people did make speeches about Miller and his qualifications. And I did make one, I remember, which was fairly successful. And most of the faculty—a great majority of the faculty I think were in

favor of keeping him on, and we did pass resolutions at the meeting, and I think they had some influence on the board because the board dropped whatever it was up to at the next meeting, and there was no more attempt to fire him. Can't think what their beef was at the time—probably just the usual.

How did the faculty feel about the N. Edd Miller Day?

Oh, I think some mild amusement, some cynicism, and generally a feeling it was a nice thing to do and wished him well. As a person, I think Edd Miller had almost no enemies on the campus. He had people who objected, as I say, to the speed with which their memos were taken care of. But almost everybody liked him; he was a genial, pleasant person and sincere person. There were no troubles there.

He originally came during the Armstrong administration before the reorganization.

That's right. Well, he came as chancellor, I guess. Yes. And Charlie Armstrong became president, didn't he? And X guess it was while Charlie was in office that they changed titles around so that Miller became president and Armstrong became chancellor. I'm not sure now that that occurred—or when that occurred, but it did occur (it may have been later).

It was in '65, and Armstrong left in '67, so—.

That's when it was, then. And that did make a difference in the ways things worked. And when Armstrong left, that left a vacancy that Humphrey filled, since he had moved into that statewide position. And after he moved into the statewide position, he was not very

popular in the campus mostly because he just never showed up on the campus. He worked out of his house a good deal and came into the office at odd hours and was really pretty hard to get in touch with.

This was Armstrong?

Armstrong, yes.

Neil [Humphrey], of course, I did know. I like Neil and admire Neil in many ways. He, I think, was not particularly qualified to be chancellor, as I conceived the chancellor's office, because he did lack any real academic training or interest. On the other hand, he was an extraordinarily honest and straightforward person; he had good relations with the legislature. He was always pretty direct and open about his procedures. He did not, I think, successfully keep a good staff in the chancellor's office, and he lost a lot of the good people he had just because he did for one reason or another, maybe a lack of—if I'm going to be amateur psychologist—maybe a lack of confidence some of the time, and he did tend to be pretty tyrannical and especially on trivial matters.

He didn't very much like to be crossed either. I spent a lot of time working on various versions of the University Code, and one occasion (I seem to remember mentioning this not long ago; maybe I put it on tape before), [chuckles] but I remember one session in which I was representing UNR, and a young fellow whose name I've forgotten—I think he was a sociologist from UNLV, and I think Don Fowler was there for Did. But we were trying to hammer out a compromise version of the code with Neil in his office. And the topic for this day was the duties of the chancellor, which were in the code. And the young fellow from Las Vegas was reasonably naive about Neil and not very tactful in any event, and he kept

proposing one after another amendment that would cut down the duties of the chancellor or the powers of the chancellor and being relatively nasty about it. And Neil got redder and redder, and finally Neil just said, "I can't stay here!" and stomped out and was gone for forty-five minutes, and said afterward he just couldn't trust himself to stay in the room with this fellow who was [laughing] doing the criticism. And it's true that it was kind of nasty, but Neil did not like that kind of objection.

He was not popular in Las Vegas the last years of the chancellorship before he did resign, and he resigned, of course, with some pressure, although not totally. I remember a couple of regents meetings which had signs around from the students to go "Dump the Hump." And he was not totally popular there, and I guess was never really popular—although as one looks back, I think he did a very good job of being chancellor in comparison with his successor [Donald Baepler] But it was never a kind of imaginative job; it was a sort of business operation and a lot of duplication.

The office grew considerably under Neil, added staff all the time, built the building downtown. And a lot of the staff really, I think, simply duplicated what was going on in the campuses, and frequently duplicated it by messing it up. This was never—that is, Neil's office was always competent in accounting, on the budget, and this kind of thing— nothing like the fiasco two years ago when Baepler's office simply messed up the budget through the two campuses enough that the Ways and Means Committee reprimanded the chancellor for the form that it came in. It had been in perfectly good shape when it left the University campus; it was that it just got confused in the chancellor's office. But Neil never messed things up in that sense, so it was there.

What do you think, in these years from 1965 to 1968, of the reorganizations from chancellors to presidents to chancellor and president—.

It probably needed to be done. And it was done, I think, largely on the basis of California as a model, and I'm not sure that the University needs the large and elaborate chancellor's office that's being built. Other states do have them. The California office and the Oregon office are big affairs; I don't know how many they employ, but large numbers compared with ours. Our chancellor's office is very small compared with those.

I don't like the idea of the chancellor's office developing the kinds of powers that exist in some chancellor's offices, in which they actually have control of staffs, and staffing is done that way, and regulations on teaching hours and so on are handed down from the chancellor's office. That kind of thing I don't like, and I don't think we are in any spot in which we need it in this state. And I guess my feeling is that the functions and size of the chancellor's office ought to be reduced rather than increased.

I would think of an organization in which there was a representative of the board, a kind of executive secretary of the board or something, with maybe some staff, who could, and would have academic and financial expertise, who could work with the presidents as the agent of the board. That is, I think it's impractical for each of the presidents to be working independently with a board of nine people; it doesn't work very well—particularly nine lay people who are not closely associated with what goes on. But I don't think that we need a central administrative office to handle or to duplicate the budget functions, and the planning functions, and so on, that do go on in the individual campuses I think those are better separated, maybe. So I would envision

a relatively small office, not necessarily a chancellor's office, but a board's executive secretary or something. But I don't know whether that's the best.

The chancellor's office has not at any stage been very popular with any of the campuses, I think. This may be due to the personnel who've been there, but of course, there've been only two chancellors, Humphrey and Baepfer—and they have been unpopular for different reasons.

I suppose each campus would ideally like to have complete autonomy.

Oh yes.

That was what led, wasn't it, to the creation of the two chancellors in the first place?

Oh, let's see, how did we—. Well, we had two chancellors, and then the titles were simply reversed. Was Charlie Armstrong ever in charge of the system? I can't even remember.

Armstrong was president of the University system when he came in after Wood. And then during his administration the change occurred.

That's right. So Charlie did—but who was president, or who was chancellor of the UNR campus when—?

Miller.

That's right. Miller came while Charlie Armstrong was still here. That's right. Sure, that's right. So we really in a sense have had three chancellors, and Charlie Armstrong was—the titles were simply not the same. And he was the president of the system, and [Don] Moyer was president or chancellor in Las Vegas

at the same time. Yeah, we managed to mix it up fairly thoroughly. But it did work, I think, in a way, except for the mix-up in names, which was never very serious, and that worked all right.
The poor historians trying to keep it straight!

Yes, one of the things that disappeared over in the office was my copy of Jimmy Hulse's history, which I see out there. I must pick one up in the library, too. I've got to talk to University Club Wednesday, and I'm supposed to be anecdotal about the (quote) "old days," and I have great trouble remembering any dates; I must look some up [laughing] in Jim's history.

Maybe you could just kind of summarize Armstrong's administration for me. Jim Hulse in his book calls him a "successful healer" after the Stout affair.

Well, that's true; he was hired after some controversy, as I mentioned, with Bill Wood as the unsuccessful candidate. And Charlie did' come in and did get good respect. I think he was a very good president, especially in the early years. He was academically respectable, which was a change. I guess he's the first president during the time I was here who really did have academic qualifications. Minard Stout was suspect; he'd done a dissertation on the financing of extracurricular activities in the state of Iowa for one year or something like that, and didn't really gain a total respect of the faculty, at least not the more academic portions of the faculty. Gilbert Parker had been an ROTC colonel. Bill Wood had a Ph.D. in English from Illinois, but he fairly quickly gave evidence that he had not spent much time remembering what he had done in his Ph.D. I remember his coming down to the English department and making all sorts of strange gaffes, like getting Milton

two centuries out of time and things like that, which were not terribly important, but which didn't add to his academic prestige. And John O. Moseley had been a Rhodes scholar, but somehow or other he never struck anybody as very much interested in academic things. Malcolm Love—I can't remember what Malcolm Love's background was; he became a very successful president at San Diego.

But anyway, Charlie Armstrong, who came in with a background in classics, and who had been at the liberal arts colleges and so on, almost immediately had faculty respect. He acted like a college president: he was a good speaker, and he was interested in academic affairs, and he didn't say stupid things, and he [chuckling]—so he was almost immediately respected. He was never very palsy with the faculty. He didn't as Edd Miller was to do later, turn up at lunch regularly someplace and spend a lot of time talking to faculty; he was never aloof, but he was never totally friendly. He was criticized by faculty frequently for spending his entertainment budget on the businessmen in town rather than entertaining the faculty and that kind of thing. I suspect, though, that may have been about what the faculty needed at that time; it needed somebody who was relatively aloof, who was respected, who did make decisions and didn't get too completely involved with faculty.

As time went on, he did become more removed from the faculty, and this became a real kind of problem. He was criticized more because nobody in the faculty knew him, they said, and this kind of thing. And he did spend increasingly more time away from the campus for one reason or another—just not coming in from time to time. And there were rumors that he was drinking too much; I never was sure of that—I just don't know whether he was or not. But he did have some sense of this aloofness.

I remember one night, I think—I can't remember—I think it was probably after he had become president (president-chancellor type president), I remember that he called one night about eleven o'clock at night, which was a little surprising, and just said he and June had been sitting around talking. They suddenly realized that they just hadn't seen anything of any students for a year or two, that they had no notion what students were thinking, what they were like; could I get together a group of twenty students and bring 'em out for an evening? And he set a date, or something like that [chuckles]. And so I did, and it was a very good evening. I got twenty honor students or something like that and three or four faculty, and we went out and just sat around and talked all evening. He had punch and cookies or something, and it was a very good evening.

But the interesting thing was that he had felt that need, and I don't know that—he may have repeated it a time or two. And it wasn't that he wasn't unfriendly ever; it was just that he tended not to make much effort to be close. I remember he used to entertain—used to be a host for the Humanities Group from time to time, and he used to come to Humanities Group meetings, and he read a paper a time or two, I think, there, so he wasn't totally aloof. But during the last years the faculty got a sense that he was not being very cooperative or very much a part of the faculty. It may have been with some reason.

It's hard for me to remember things that he did, specifically, which is curious, because I think a lot was accomplished during those years, and a lot of it he had a hand in; but he tended simply to make the decisions and keep things moving. And he did make decisions. People complained, as they always do, that too many things piled up on the president's desk, and I think that complaint would be there no matter who the president was, and probably

would be true [chuckles]; things just do pile up there—sometimes with good reasons, sometimes because the president wants to postpone the decision!

But he did make decisions?

Yes, he did; I think he was a very good president most of the time, and I have a feeling, as people look back, they will agree that he was a good president. He did feel some aloofness, I think. Well, I remember he wrote a letter when I retired last spring for a book of letters that I got, and one of the things he said—and it was true—was that although we had spent less time together socially while he was president than we might have or than we both might have wanted to have, that he had always felt we were fairly close and fairly friendly. And I think that was true, that we both did feel that, even though we saw each other much less than, say, I'd see Edd Miller. And we were at the house a few times but not with a great frequency, and I think they were at our house. Charlie was up, I guess, at commencement time maybe, and we saw him some—it was two or three years, he was up for something, and we saw him. He came over to the house for a drink and stayed, as I remember, till two in the morning or something, sitting around talking. And he's in San Diego now, and he and Tom O'Brien play golf once or twice a week. And I hear from him at least at Christmastime and other times.

Apparently there was a lot of criticism of June Armstrong while he was here for reasons I was never sure of, but except that June was not a traditional faculty-wife-mixer type. And Charlie was, I think, very hard hit when she died, oh, it's been quite a while ago now, but she did die of cancer while he was at Ohio, where he went after he left here. And it apparently bothered him a good deal.

It sounds as though they were very close just from what you've said.

Yeah, much closer than anybody realized. She was a kind of strange person in some ways. I always kind of liked her, but she was crazy, and it was a kind of crazy that you sort of like. And she would make undiplomatic statements about people from time to time that got her into trouble, and she was usually right most of the time [laughing]. And she was not terribly attractive. And she didn't make a great effort to be friendly or to be proper or popular, and that was, I think, part of the reason for—the faculty wives can be just as catty as any other group, and they tended to be [chuckles].

Why did he leave? Hulse suggests that he may have been a casualty of resentment against control from Reno.

Partly that was it. There was pressure. I don't really know—I think he was fairly sick of it, and when he got the other job opportunity, he took it. You know, I can't really be sure, but I don't think that he was under immediate pressure to leave; that is, I mean, I don't think he had any kind of ultimatum. The way one usually resigns is that the board—somebody on the board says, "I've got five votes. Don't you want to resign?" And Max Milan said, "No, I don't," and so he was fired. Humphrey said, "Yes," and so he resigned. And I don't know whether Charlie had that kind of ultimatum or not. I don't think he did, but I think the handwriting was there. And he did get this other kind of interesting job, and I think just felt that maybe he'd had enough time here. I think I talked to him about it, but I can't remember well enough to say what happened that's—. I remember talking with him when he was

making a decision to leave. I can't remember [laughing].

I notice you have Don Moyer on your list. I hardly knew him. I don't really remember much about him.

He was very active in a lot of lobbying and faculty affairs, and I thought you might have had a contact with him.

Yes, I guess so. No, I don't really remember much about him. He had an office in the top floor of the library, and took up quite a lot of space; it might've been better covered with books (but they didn't have the books). But I didn't know him particularly.

What did you think about the reorganization as a whole? I know that I've read that there were several alternative schemes.

I guess most of us in the faculty here probably thought that it was a good scheme and a necessary scheme, that if we made the institutions just independent and gave them full authority over everything—if we did that, well, it was going to do several things: it would give the Vegas campus the advantage for resources, going directly to the board; there wouldn't be any filtering through there at all. And another problem was that the chancellor was needed to pull things together, to specify the kinds of cooperation that would exist and so on. So that on the whole, I think people felt that the reorganization was pretty much necessary. There were objections in the Reno campus to giving Las Vegas all that prestige or authority or extra money, this kind of thing. And they did want the ceremony to be local, or at least they wanted to have a local ceremony so it was not totally popular—the whole thing. But on the whole people went along with it, I think. Didn't really have any immediate

effect that was discernible at all. It just continued pretty much as it had before.

The DRI separation was part of the package at the time. And I don't know when we put in the community college director—that must have been early seventies. Well, then [Charles] Donnelly was hired, I think, before the first community college was opened. Yeah, he was hired I think partly to oversee the opening and to coordinate the activities, generally. He, of course, was fired three or four years ago, and that was not a popular move generally; it was the regents again engineering things, I think mostly for personal reasons. And he was fired sometime before Milan was, but I think it was all part of the sane general movement. I was reminded of it because we've just put on in the budget and institutional studies spot, Al Knorr, who was one year in the chancellor's office in Carson City some years ago, where he got into trouble apparently because he did not agree with the chancellor on every issue every moment. And Humphrey fired him after one year.

But he had a very distinguished record when he came here. He'd been in the California system for some time, but we just hired him back at UNR for the next few years. And he will have a lot of good information, I think, of different kinds when he gets going.

I was reminded of him now because the night Donnelly was fired in Las Vegas—it was a Board of Regents meeting, and poor Donnelly I guess, didn't really ever get the word. But it was kind of floating around—all around, you know, that he'd been fired, and well, he managed to get very drunk, as I recall, with probably good reason [chuckling], and drove up an off-ramp of the freeway, I think somebody told me, which was not a good move.

But that was the start of a series of very uncomfortable meetings about that time. And

I think they maybe took a vote on Milan at the time and couldn't quite come up with enough votes to fire him [laughing], but they did have enough for Donnelly.

One of the kinds of things that worked for articulation, I think, and made it simpler, was the organization of the community colleges with a president and then local administrators under the president. This, as you recall, was stopped a few years ago for the wrong reasons again. The board had developed a number of people who didn't like Chuck Donnelly, who was the president of the Community College System, so that again, in order to implement getting rid of a person that some members of the board didn't like, we changed the entire system and put in a set of presidents for each of the community college divisions, each of them reporting directly to the board. And I think that is probably not as good an organization as the one that was had before. And there's been talk about appointing again a coordinator of the college presidents, which makes a kind of interesting circular way—I don't know whose “law” this is, but it's a kind of interesting way of manipulating things so that you multiply administration—that is, you fire a president and then create four presidents, and then you have to hire a kind of super-president over the other presidents, so that instead of cutting down on administration, you multiply it considerably. But that may not happen—I don't know.

What do you see as the role of the community college, then? Do you think they should be primarily vocational?

No, the major purpose of the community colleges, I suppose, is to handle a lot of subjects that the University cannot and should not be burdened with; that is, University faculty are not trained to do courses in—oh, in

business machines or shorthand or typing, for example, and they're not the best institutions for doing it. I think what one has to do as far as making these decisions is to try to decide what kind of institution or what kind of educational device is the most efficient to do what particular kinds of jobs. And to make the assumption that a university ought to do all of them is a mistake. Some of them, it seems to me, certainly are best handled by on-the-job training, apprenticeship training, or simply in-service training on the job; and I think in many instances what we pretend to do in the university is better done that way.

I remember, for example, I was a journalism student when I started, and I remember being told by an old newspaperman who was head of the department at Indiana—I went around the first week of school to him as my advisor to see what I should take, and I had a very nice program laid out of Headline Writing II, and Type Sizes IV, and how to write feature stories, and so on—all straight journalism. And he took one look at it and handed it back to me and said, "I don't want to see any of that stuff. You go out and learn something, and then come back and we'll talk about journalism."

Well, he knew I'd worked on newspapers and he knew I knew how to write headlines—I thought this was going to be a real breeze, you know! [Laughs] But I think he was right; he then went on and said further, "You can learn all this stuff in one week on a paper when you have to do it. Why don't you go out and learn some political science and some history and some English and things like that?" And a lot of journalists still say this, including some of the journalism staff here, I think, that the important thing is much less the technical training than it is the general university training.

Well, this is a very roundabout way of saying that a university, which is essentially

a bunch of academically minded faculty and a library and some students, is not the best way to teach people to become plumbers, and it's not the best way to do a lot of other things, and it's silly to waste our energy in an inefficient kind of system. So that an apprenticeship seems to me much the best way to train plumbers. On the other hand, since apprenticeship programs are not working, it may be that you have to set up substitutes for apprenticeship programs, and the community colleges are serving that purpose in many ways. It's also true that a university has to maintain certain kinds of academic standards if it's going to operate, and most of the staff members are trained and oriented toward meeting students at a certain level, don't have the educational skills to treat the students who are not very well prepared academically. So, the community college serves a purpose in getting academically-weak people and perhaps giving them the remedial training that they need to go to college and then to transfer—so that I think the transfer program does have a function. It may be true that in all these instances what it's doing is producing a lot of half-educated people who would be better off without the academic training, who don't really want it, but think the social pressures of having it require the prestige. But there are also these days an increasing number of students who really are capable of academic work and interested in it, who can be brought to university level with some specialized remedial training.

So, the community colleges on the whole, I think, are accurate in their claim that they attract very few students who would otherwise go to the university. Now they do attract some because of the lower fee and tuition scale, and because, (this may be a false charge but, I think, not totally) because the courses are easier in many instances, and they can get

through them, and then transfer the credits and be all right. And an amazing number of them transfer credits from bad courses and get along all right in the university, and so the university is not spotless in this subject of academic standards. I don't know how we got onto that now!

Well, we were talking generally about functions of the different parts of the system. It's a difficult question, but I think very, very important in the long run. And you hear people in the legislature and the assembly Ways and Means Committee who have no hesitation about giving us the answers. And part of the problem is that if the board doesn't approach it, then the decisions are going to be made by the kind of stupidity that came out of the Ways and Means Committee Monday, in which you get Peggy Westall saying that we shouldn't mess around with philosophy and anthropology and all that kind of uninformed garbage. It's there.

And how much time is spent on research.

Oh yes, that's right. Young Steve Coulter, who didn't qualify for a job in journalism, is mad and is going to get even by saying everybody—well, it's partly a rationalization for his own position. He has never done any research, so that you take the position that that's all the faculty are interested in because they don't appreciate what a good teacher he is or was, and didn't hire him again. That's the kind of risk you run, I guess.

Do you think that the Board of Regents will deal with the question of functions?

Well, I don't know. The ten-year plan that the board requested—and I don't know whether you've seen the University's version of that—Dick Davies was chairman of the

group that put it together, and I saw it just a week or so ago for the first time, and it seems to be a very good job. And it does address this question. And [Robert A.] Cashell and some of the board members requested it, and at least they're going to have to deal with it, and it may be that they'll look at the question. And I suppose ironically, one of the things that inevitably is going to occur if the legislature continues this kind of austerity program—inevitably the board's going to be forced to make some decisions there. Now, it may do, of course, what it has done in the past, and what turns out to be the easy way out, which is simply do percentage cuts all over, and that's the easy approach to it. But I'm not sure that the board will take that approach; it may at least try to be a little more imaginative this time—I don't know.

There is, of course, so darn little flexibility in the budget, which is—I think—I can't remember now exactly, but I think the University budget, something like eighty-five or ninety percent of it is in set costs that you just can't juggle any way, except by cutting faculty; you can do that with the salary portions of the budget. But so much of it is committed before the budget is ever made: the utility costs, the salary costs, the salary increase costs, the contracts for tenured faculty. And it runs, as I remember, to something near eighty-five, ninety percent of the total budget. There's just no flexibility in any of the budget. so it may not work very well—force the decisions that way.

The students during the sixties didn't seem to me much different from students at any other time, and UNR never really experienced the kind of student revolt or student shift to greater awareness that was true all over the country. And I think even during the sixties, I don't remember ever

being in the class in which I didn't think I was more radical or liberal or something than the students! [Laughs] And I don't consider myself very radical or liberal. But students almost always remained sort of apathetic and quiet. And I never had the slightest trouble with trying to curb student rebelliousness or anything of that sort. It always seemed to me there ought to be more student rebelliousness than we had here.

There was, of course, one incident—the Adamian business, and I don't know when that occurred now, but it must have been—. Maybe it was as late as '70. Well, yeah, it was certainly after Edd Miller was here.

And that was really almost the only incident we had. There was a sit-in of two or three blacks for a day or so in a room in the Union building, but that was a kind of strange operation. I think mostly they just wanted office space for something or other; it wasn't really any very significant protest. And Edd Miller solved that somehow by going over and talking to them or something, and so not much ever came of that.

So by and large the student revolt business never amounted to much. We put students on committees, but they never attended. As far as I can tell, all the zeal during the sixties for “relevance” and the talk about how courses had to be made “relevant”—there was some of that talk around, of course, but nothing much ever came of it. And the students weren't really greatly concerned about the curriculum, I think. Some were, of course, but some always are—but the general student movement, I think, didn't touch Nevada very firmly.

I wonder why.

Oh, I think there are several reasons for it. One of them, the general conservatism of the state—that is, the state tends to

be—well, maybe general conservatism isn't right—the paradoxical conservatism, maybe, in which you have the most liberal principles anyplace on things like gambling and prostitution and other matters that are sometimes called “moral issues”—that very liberal attitude, but at the same time, some very conservative, old-fashioned attitudes on the same very subjects. That is, all this freedom with prostitution is coupled with—well, coupled with two-to-one plebiscite against the EPA, for example. And the kind of double standard notion for women, which is still very common. This is the “tough, old West,” and there are two kinds of women, and some of them you treat well, and some of them you marry and keep in their place. All of these things are part of it. And also part of that is that you object to authority some of the time—you know, we have all this individualism and stuff that gets talked about quite a lot. The “tough Westerner” who can't have any gun control in the state because were tough individuals, and we have to protect our homes and so on. You get all of that kind of individualism, but still a considerable respect for quite conservative authority— not necessarily the people in authority, but the idea of authority.

And so there was that natural conservatism for one thing. The other, of course, was the isolation, the provincialism, generally just because the state is out of the mainstream of quick movements. Any kind of movement almost always is three or four years late when it hits Nevada, which is a fine thing, academically, I think, because a lot of the nonsense gets disproved before it ever starts here. We never, for example—we never gave up foreign languages as a requirement; just because we were so slow, that by the time we got around to having any great student and faculty pressure to get rid of the foreign

language requirement, other places were putting it back in! So we [laughing] gained from doing it, and that worked.

Well, we might look back, then, at the Desert Research Institute a little bit. It was a kind of vague idea that William Ransome Wood had, who was—and I suspect I mentioned that Bill Wood had been brought in by Stout and was regarded by the faculty as a kind of hatchet man for Stout, although this wasn't necessarily true, but he was just inevitably a controversial kind of figure when he came in. And he did stay on as acting president after Stout left for about a year, and there was all sorts of elaborate faculty and public politicking when Armstrong was appointed on the subject of getting William Ransome Wood on as the regular president. And as I remember, he lost by one vote in the regents' meeting or something, and Armstrong was then appointed.

And Wood had had during his year as acting president this notion—a pretty vague one—of some kind of desert research project which seemed to him fitting the University of Nevada's image and also being a way to bring in some money. Nothing ever came of it, and the idea was vague enough that it didn't get very far, but it did one way or another catch somebody's imagination, and the board as well. And Wendell Mordy was brought in—I don't know exactly when; it must have been around 1960-'61, along in there. Mordy was brought in as director of the Desert Research Institute, which was a part of the University of Nevada, Reno. It was not a separate arm of the University system. But it was a way of developing the research potential on the campus, and Mordy came in to direct that.

He was very successful in many ways almost immediately. He was successful in raising money, and he brought in a number of quite good research people to develop his

projects. And he got Fleischmann support; he got a lot of federal grants. This was the beginning of the boom of federal support for research—the post-Sputnik kind of thing. And he developed particularly an atmospheric physics program which was—he was a physicist, and this was part of his interest.

This program, I think, did quite a lot for research on the campus, stimulated research among others, and it was Mordy's main interest to develop research on a campuswide basis. I was connected with it—I think maybe I mentioned this—I was connected with it because one of the ideas that Mordy had was to use the overhead money generated by the research projects in the Desert Research Institute as a way of stimulating research throughout the campus. And he appointed three, I guess, or maybe four associate directors of the institute, and I was one of them. And we had a quarter released time for the purpose of trying to distribute some of this overhead money to people in the various disciplines who were interested in developing their own research. And it was an interesting kind of project. And as sort of an outsider in the whole thing, I was associate director for humanities, which was not one of the general researches, and which didn't bring any of the money. I remember at meetings I always introduced myself as teaching "desert English" or something. And it was a way of getting the money spread around a little, and this worked.

From almost the beginning, though, there were troubles in connection with the Desert Research Institute. One thing that happened was that Mordy brought in people to work in the institute at salaries higher than the salaries of people who were already on the campus. He justified this, I think probably rightly, by saying that he wanted the best people he could get, and they came high,

and he had the government money to pay for them, and that was the way you built a good research institute. But there was a good deal of resentment on the campus when somebody was brought in from Australia, let's say, at a salary higher than the head of the existing department was getting. So that caused some trouble. There was also a feeling in some of the departments, particularly in some of the science departments, that Mordy was an empire builder, and what he was doing was getting research grants at the expense of the regular research that the departments would ordinarily be doing, so that some resentment built up there.

And then another kind of difficulty arose because Neil Humphrey, who was controller of the University at the time, looked at this overhead money and took the literally logical attitude that the overhead money was intended to pay for the overhead expenses of the grants on the campus, and that therefore, it was totally improper to distribute these overhead monies to other departments as a way of stimulating research. So Mordy and Humphrey, who were the kinds of people who I think looked never at any subject from the same point of view, developed a kind of—not rivalry, but developed antagonism at a very early stage, and this grew and grew. It finally got to the Board of Regents level, and Mordy kept insisting that he could not operate with Humphrey's kinds of what he called "restraints;" that is, that he couldn't worry about Humphrey's views on salaries, he could not follow Humphrey's views on purchasing. There was always an argument that Humphrey insisted on Mordy's following certain regulations, and Mordy didn't believe in the regulations. So that ultimately, I think, for the wrong reasons— and I remember arguing with— (I was a good friend of Mordy's, and in fact, I saw him in St. Paul

just about a year and a half ago. He's now director of the St. Paul Museum of Science, very successful operation, and he's doing very well with it. And I was in Minneapolis for a meeting and went out to see him). But I argued a long time with Mordy against his insistence that the Desert Research Institute be separated from the University. But he was absolutely convinced it should be, and he did convince the Board of Regents that it should be split; it was set up as a separate arm of the University system.

Soon after that, then, the chancellorship was established, and Mordy and Neil Humphrey became the leading candidates for the chancellorship. And this was not a totally friendly battle, but when Humphrey won, Mordy was pretty much doomed as director of the Desert Research Institute, not because Humphrey was being vindictive, which he was not, but just because it made it harder for them to work together. And they were both reasonably open about their feelings about the other; it was not [chuckles]—it was not any hidden or undercover antagonism. They just disagreed so consistently that it worked.

And Mordy, I think fairly wisely, did leave the directorship of DRI. But in the process he had built quite a successful working organization. It worked better when federal money was available during the sixties than it has since in some ways, although it's continued to flourish. He brought a lot of good people here: Pat Squires came from Australia, and Joy Leland, who was his, I guess, general assistant or something, did an amazingly successful job of keeping the thing going; she was an important part of DRI through all of that. Frits Went was brought in. He helped certain departments develop; for example, Warren d'Azevedo originally came through DRI sponsorship and ultimately started the department of anthropology. It

was largely Mordy's assistance and operation that got the anthropology department started. Joe Warburton came from Australia; he's still with the institute. And there's been development of some cooperative activity. DRI furnishes a good deal of instruction through the physics department, finances assistantships for part of it, but works with regular members of the physics department to offer a degree. And it seems to be quite a workable scheme and one of the relatively few but successful ways of cooperation between the University and DRI.

You mentioned that people thought Wendell Mordy was an empire builder. Was he? What kind of person was he?

Yes, sure he was. He was not, I think, an empire builder in the sense that he was personally ambitious to build an empire, but he was an empire builder in the sense that he wanted to build the biggest and best research institute he could. And he was inclined to do that no matter what the obstacles were.

And he was not an obnoxious person in any sense, although a lot of people didn't like Wendell, I think. He tended to be tactless sometimes, and he—oh! [Laughs] There was, I remember, a party fairly early after he came at the [Robert] Haney's, in which Wendell decided he was going to play a game. And the game was to say the most insulting—to meet somebody and say the most insulting thing he could to that person. And there were people in on the game, and the trouble with it was that he tended very frequently to say something that was insulting [chuckling] and that hurt people in the game. The game just never worked very well that evening. And I remember the hostess and some others were very much upset by the procedure, and it was just a kind of awkward and silly thing to do.

Brooke, his wife, who never had any kind of nasty motive at all or who never was tactless, discovered what was going on, stopped it before it [laughs]—! But he had no notion that he was being insulting or harmful to anybody; he just thought this was kind of a fun game that somebody had mentioned, and why he thought it up [laughing] I don't know!

But that kind of thing he did sometimes, and it did bother people; plus the fact that there was some jealousy over the salaries and the tact that it was being very successful with research—and the fact that he was also willing to try to put on pressure to get research going (that is, he tried to do it). Oh, he had at one stage insisted on being made a vice president for research, I remember. And I can't remember whether he ever was or not; I don't think he ever was, but I know he wanted to be and put on pressure with the regents. And again, I think that this wasn't because he coveted any title, but because he thought it would give him a freer hand in trying to develop the research projects. No, he did a lot of good the time he was here, I think, in spite of a lot of opposition.

Did he have a pretty good working relationship with the regents?

With some of the regents—as so frequently happens, he was—well, he would have been chancellor if he had had a working arrangement with enough of them. And I can't even divide the board on that subject; a lot of the regents thought he was very good and worked with him, but some of them liked Humphrey better or were turned in another direction.

At the start he had a very good working relationship with the regents, of course. But as the controversies developed, the regents tended to split the subject. When he left there

was a—I can't even remember details—there was a controversy over the unpaid salary. And I think he either sued or settled out of court, and I think he got a year's salary when he left. I think he was paid a year's salary, something like that, after some fairly unpleasant discussion and talk about it. I'm not sure that he's—well, yes, they were out here last year, I think, sometime or other. We saw them just one evening; they stayed at Leland's and were here for a while. I think maybe that's the first he's been back since he left.

So he didn't leave with particularly good feelings—.

Oh no, no, a lot of bad feelings on the board and on the faculty, too. A lot of good feelings, too, but I'd guess that there were more bad feelings than good on the whole [laughing].

[You mentioned that there was support for Humphrey for chancellor and support for Mordy, and I was curious how that was arranged. Was it the scientific people behind Mordy and the humanities people behind Humphrey, or was it not that clear-cut?]

No, no, nothing like that. No, probably Mordy had more support from humanities people, and—well, I don't know either that that was their—but there was no such division. And I can't really remember how the board divided. I can't much remember what faculty attitudes were. The faculty wasn't much consulted on the subject. There wasn't any committee, as I remember, or anything like that. I think it was a board decision pretty much. No, I can't remember. But there wasn't any division by discipline, anything of that sort, no.

Did DRI have a status similar to a college or a department when it was part of the University?

I guess part of Mordy's worry was that it didn't have a very well defined kind of structure. It was sort of separate; that is, he had a kind of status like that of a dean; I don't know whether he was called dean or not. I think he was director of Desert Research Institute always. He was on the Academic Council, and he had de facto status as much as a dean, I think. He had direct access to the president, of course, and I think reported directly to the president, and ultimately, through grants, had two buildings that were pretty much under their control—the Atmospherium and the Water Resources building—both of which were built while Mordy was director, I think. And his offices were in the Water Resources building for a time.

That's a hard one to answer. I'm not quite sure how that administrative organization was defined. And that may very well have been part of the problem, that it wasn't clearly enough defined, and it seemed to be outside but not outside. And Mordy's main concern was that it was under general University regulations, and he thought this handicapped him in hiring staff and buying equipment and that kind of thing. And I think if he'd put his mind to trying to cooperate, I think it would have worked all right, but—.

What reasons did you give him in arguing, then, to keep it part of the University?

Oh well, I can't, remember totally, but my general feeling about it was that it was important to develop research on the campus, and that the Desert Research Institute served a very useful purpose in developing and stimulating research on a campuswide basis. And that if it were separated, it would not only multiply administration, but it would detract from the effectiveness of the University as a research institution. I think

I was partly right and partly wrong in that it probably flourished separately more than it would have otherwise as an institution. On the other hand, I think that it did spread research over the state—was economically not as sound as research focused in one place, and I guess part of my—I think part of my selfish motive was that I was concerned to get UNR identified as the research institution of the Nevada system, partly to avoid rivalry with Las Vegas on which would become the research institution, and partly because I was convinced and still am that the state at this time is not able to support two genuine research institutions. It just costs too much to build two research libraries, for example, or anything else. And splitting DRI tended to diffuse the research activities, which I thought were better focused in one place at UNR. And that was most of my reason, plus the fact that I thought Mordy's reasons for splitting it were the wrong ones. I thought they were trivial and personal, and that it would have been much better not to do it that way—at least not for those reasons.

Mordy was a person, or is a person, with dozens of ideas, good ideas, and he's a kind of promoter and hard worker, but not the salesman type at all. And he had a good academic background, and he did most of his studying in Sweden, as I remember; he was a physicist. But he did, I think, do quite a lot for the University in the time he was here, although I wish he had let DRI stay in UNR where it was doing well.

The University Press was set up about then, too, Wasn't it, in the sixties? There'd been some University publication going on before that, I think; I don't know how much. But I guess maybe the press was formally organized then. And in some measure it took over a lot of sort of pedestrian activities that had been mixed up—I think, for example, the press

people started editing the catalog for a time; I don't know whether they still do. When I first came or a few years after, I used to get released from a course once in a while in order to edit the catalog, I remember. And I think it was taken over then by the press office or publications office, maybe it was called, and sort of combined with the University Press.

And the press certainly hadn't produced much, but it did get going about that time. And among its projects about that time, it must have bought the Doten diaries from a bookseller in San Francisco, who charged them, I think, far too much for them. I can't remember how that purchase came about, but we did buy those lengthy Virginia City diaries of Alf Doten. And at the same time I was interested in them because at the same time partly through the efforts of Bob Laxalt (who probably was made director of the press about that time, but partly through his efforts), money was made available to hire Walter Clark half-time to edit the diaries.

The original proposal was to write a novel out of the diaries and to be half-time in the English department, which was good for the English department. And so Walter did come over about that time and did start this half-and-half job, which he continued up until the time he died.

He worked on those diaries interminably; he couldn't pull himself away from them, I think. He wrote the first chapter of the novel he was supposed to write I suppose twenty times, but he never wrote the second one. And he became more and more frustrated with the diaries and at the same time, of course, was teaching half-time, which was almost always full-time for Walter; he was a devoted teacher, and doing anything half-time was very hard for him. And he finally did give up on writing a novel. Well, he didn't put it that way; at least the rationalization was that he had to edit the

diaries before he could do the novel because he couldn't tell what was in the diaries until he did.

So he did set out on a monumental job of editing the diaries, and he stayed with that, really, until the time of his death; he'd never quite finished them at the time of his death. His son, Bob Clark, did do some final editing on the diaries, and they are, of course, now in print. But that was one of the early projects started by the press, although it wasn't completed for a long time after that; three or four years ago the diaries finally came out, I think.

They also started a history series and so on. Bob Laxalt, who took it over, did, of course, have some prestige because of the novel he had had, and also because of his relationship to Paul, who was either governor or about to become governor—maybe he was attorney general at the time. And Bob, who's quite different—totally apolitical—did take over the press, not I think very aggressively, but maybe fairly wisely, getting it started.

He was a student of mine, actually—Bob Laxalt was, and not the best student I'd had. His brother, Pete, was a brilliant student. But Bob was a dedicated student, and among other things, he was a disciple of Walter Clark, whom he met, I think, while Walter was at San Francisco. And Walter helped him with his writing and did read manuscripts and gave him a lot of advice on his writing, and that helped. And Bob has since done two or three novels and some nice articles and so on and I have a feeling thinks of himself at least partly as a writer-in-residence or something rather than an administrator of the press.

I don't know, when did the Medical School get started? That must have been about that time, too. The pressures, of course, for a medical school and a law school and an architecture school and a journalism school

have always existed because the people who are in those professions feel that that's the most important thing and that no state should be without one. The medical profession, I suppose, is both more affluent and more influential than the others, and so they were the ones that made their interests most immediately and most firmly known. And again, there were a lot of circumstances which increased the enthusiasm for a two-year medical school at least. The presence of both Doctors Fred Anderson and Louis Lombardi on the board had something to do with it. And Fred was a particularly strong advocate of a medical school and worked very, very hard in trying to get it on.

The board did finally vote to—you know, to explore this kind of thing, and George [T.] Smith was brought out to look into it. And George turned out to be an extremely good fund raiser and extremely good lobbyist and extremely good promoter. And George managed to get the medical profession almost unified—an impossible task usually. But they did seem to be pretty unanimously behind the notion of starting a medical school. And of course, all the guarantees were that it was to be two years only; it wouldn't cost very much. And the argument with the legislature was that a two-year medical school would be a way of increasing medical services in the cow counties where the only real difficulties in having a sufficient population of doctors occurred.

Well, there were some of us who opposed—I was one of them. This was actually after [N.] Edd Miller came, though, so it was later than '67. At least it hadn't been established. I remember it because I remember making a speech against the Medical School in a faculty meeting, and I know Edd was upset by it; he talked to me afterward, trying to convince me that I was wrong, which maybe I was. My only argument was that the

medical schools cost so much that they tend to overwhelm the rest of the institution, and I just was not convinced then (as I'm not now, actually) that the need for a local medical training was great enough to warrant the cost in a state in which the education budget can't stand a tremendous amount of increase. So I did oppose it at the time, but I do remember it was Edd Miller who was upset with me because I did. And I may have been wrong, although one prediction that a lot of us were making, which was that it would not be a two-year medical school very long before the pressures were there to make a four-year school, and that prediction has, I'm sure, proved to be a fairly good one.

The legislature, too, was much interested in it. I'm surprised and pleased that the legislature didn't remember better than it usually does, because at the time the two-year school was established, there were constant promises that it would never become a four-year school, and the legislature agreed to fund it only that it would never—. But it doesn't seem to have caused much trouble later, and I think making it a four-year school was obviously a good rule and a good procedure.

[What kind of person was George Smith? He was obviously a very successful lobbyist.]

Yes, he was, and a dynamic person. George is not a big fellow; he's shorter than I am, soft-spoken by and large, very friendly. He was back here at commencement time for the graduation of the first four-year class. He was married and divorced, and married again while he was here, and since divorced again, and married again. I met his current wife. He came from a small town in West Virginia, I think. His father, I think, was a small-town doctor. He was totally devoted to the Medical School thing; I think there was no doubt about his dedication to medical training and to this kind of program.

And among other things, with the two-year program, he and some of the people he'd brought here did have, I think, some revolutionary ideas about medical training. Oversimplified, they were interested in a kind of broader—"humane," I should say—education for the doctor than the strictly traditional technical orientation. Bud Baldwin, for example, whom George brought out, had a national reputation for some of this kind of innovation in medical training.

I was never quite convinced of the validity of the approach they were taking, or at least of the humanities portion of it, because I thought they were not really doing what they pretended to do. For example, they put in courses like Medical Ethics and Medical Vocabulary and Medical Communication, and maybe there was one called the Sociology of Medicine, something like that. Now all of those seem to me moves in the right direction, but I think they would have been better off if they hadn't continued to keep them oriented so closely to medicine. If they had really taken the step of trying to make civilized people out of doctors, instead of technicians, then I think it would have worked better. But that was their motive; their ultimate goal was that the doctor should be an educated and a humanitarian human being, rather than simply a technician.

They also instituted some reforms in the straight medical training, in which they put things into blocks, and instead of having—now I'm not sure I remember this exactly, but I think they worked it that instead of having a course in strictly anatomy or in strictly pathology, they organized it in terms of the parts of the body—I think I'm right about this—so that you had head and neck looked at through your four different points of view, rather than the traditional courses. You got the head and neck looked (this is not right,

really), but you got the head and neck looked at anatomically, and I think you got it looked at from the point of view of physiology, or whatever you look at it now, or else you look at it—that kind of thing. That isn't quite the way they did it, but it was a reordering of the materials from the traditional way.

Well, both of those were significant innovations in the two-year school, and so far as I can tell, I think both of those have been almost completely abandoned since they shifted to the four-year school, so that it's now pretty much a traditional medical-school curriculum. And that is not a criticism in any way; it's a comment only, and I suppose the comment really is on the power of the American Medical Association over medical schools. I have a feeling that this is a very bad kind of influence.

The AMA through its accreditation power really dictates very precisely what medical schools are about and what they do. Some of it is purely a matter of maintaining standards; that is, they require that there be a three-and-a-half-to-one student-faculty ratio. That's pretty good—I've commented to the Medical School people that I could even teach people to write English if I had a three-and-a-half-to-one ratio—maybe could do it with five-to-one ratio [chuckling]. But it's a question of which is more important. But they'd made that stick, and the American Medical Association just says, "We'll jerk your accreditation if you don't meet these requirements." Well, that's probably good, and if I thought I could mount that successful a lobby among English teachers, I might do it!

But the result also is that I think AMA influences the schools to do pretty much what the AMA members had. That is, I think the AMA accreditation discourages innovation in medical school programs; I think it tends to make it easier to do what medical schools

have been doing for a long time. And partly under pressure of that sort and partly because—. Well, we did get a lot of new faculty in when we went to the four-year school; the curriculum has become much more like the curricula in other medical schools, which may be a good move, I don't know.

It, of course, has had changes in administration—George left, and Tom Scully took over. Tom was ill last year and had to drop the deanship, and in fact had to drop everything for a time. He's now back teaching, and Ernie Mazzaferri was head of the medicine department, has been acting as dean, and has been, I think, doing a superb job as dean. But he doesn't want to stay on with the job [chuckles], and we're having trouble getting a permanent dean.

Fred Anderson had a lot to do with starting it. Fred had been interested in a medical school for many, many years, and I think with reasons. The medical profession generally backed it as long as it looked as if it would be only a two-year school and would not present any real threat to them, in the sense of having regular staff coming in from the outside who might be rivals in surgery or something of that sort.

They also—I think the medical profession (I'm being maybe partly cynical about 'em now)—but I think the medical profession looked on the opportunity of teaching as really a kind of interesting outlet, and I think many of the local doctors looked on this as a kind of pleasant way of doing some real community service because they could move in and teach and run clinical services and so on. And I think they were a little naive about how much they could do and how it would work. I think their support was partly based on a wrong notion of how the school would work. I'm guessing now, but I think a lot of it was there. Anyway, the medical profession did

by and large support the idea of the two-year school. There was a good deal of pressure.

And then there was the additional attraction that it was pretty easy to collect money. There were some grants through wills; there ultimately was money from Howard Hughes's estate—not really very much, but it was money without strings, which could be used for operating and which was to extend over a ten-year period. There was money for buildings that became available, and George Smith, who came in, was a very good promoter and a very hard-working person and a good person generally who believed in all of it. And there was further a kind of genuine interest that George had and some of the others had in doing a different kind of medical school and making some real changes in medical education.

So the school did start with a good deal of enthusiasm from the legislature. It started on a relatively small scale, but it was immediately popular. In order to build its enrollment and make it work, there was a committee established to promote health sciences, and some curricular changes were made in order to develop a kind of health sciences program. It was all done pretty much informally, and the registrar would say totally illegally (and I think he's probably right) that courses were put in that nobody was sure were there, that degrees were being offered that had never been approved through the Health Sciences Program. And from the very start, the Medical School was, to be very polite about it, "informal" in its arrangements.. But it did very quickly get enough student interest to prove that there was a real demand for all the health sciences business.

This was part of the notion of the changed or the, I guess, reformed, even, you could call it, medical training, in which there was to be an emphasis on things like medical ethics

and approaches to family care, preventive medicine— all these things were to get an emphasis; plus the fact that the curriculum was to be arranged in a kind of different sequence, and I can't give you details of it, but instead of doing a course in anatomy and a course in something else, it was to be arranged differently so that you had some anatomy and some internal medicine and then some diagnosis or something else, and it all worked into a kind of sequence.

But anyway, it was different and plausible and interesting, and it worked, and students liked it. It drove the registrar mad because the courses were at different times and in different ways, and the grading was informal, and all sorts of things were not fitting the regular patterns. But it tended to work that way.

One of the things that has happened over the years, and as the four-year programs come in, is that the school has, I think—I'm not an authority on what traditional medical education is—but I think what has gradually happened is that the school has come much nearer to being a traditional medical school than it was at the start, that most of the innovative ideas—and partly, I think, because they proved not to be as useful as some of the others have—have faded away, and in general the curriculum is much more traditional than it was. Partly, this is true because a lot of new people have come in who have had long experience in other medical schools, and who tend to turn it in that direction. But it still has been an interesting kind of experiment, and there still are some emphases that are different. The emphasis on family practice, for example, is not a totally traditional one.

That, I suspect, is all that I remember much about the early development of the Medical School. All the time I was in the vice president's office, and also while I was dean for the Arts and Science, there were problems

within the Medical School and problems of fitting the somewhat different attitudes and organization of the Medical School into the regular University pattern. Oh, in the very earliest days, I remember, when George Smith brought people in, he wanted to bring them in with tenure. And the rest of the faculty thought we needed to follow University regulations on tenure. And this kind of thing—and it was one example of the kinds of differences that have existed almost from the start with the Medical School. And with some reason, I suspect, the Medical School has not wanted to conform to regular University procedures and regulations, and the rest of the University has thought it should.

One thing I think is especially interesting about the Medical School is that it has remained a part of the University, and at least the current feeling in the medical faculty I think is that this is a good thing. And it's unusual. The usual pattern is that a medical school is pretty much separated from the rest of the university, that the faculty is a separate faculty not very cooperative with the rest of the faculty. In fact, it's pretty common that a medical school exists in a city forty miles from the regular campus, or maybe farther—the Cornell med school was in New York when I was at Cornell, and that's a couple of hundred miles away. But here, the Medical School faculty cooperate on committees of the regular faculty, work on those committees; they follow regular University procedures, follow the bylaws procedures; the dean is on the Academic Council; and the Medical School faculty is fairly influential in regular—represented on the senate much more than is common, I think. The Medical School here is a part of the regular institution, and I think that's

very good. And it isn't always easy for either group, but it seems to be a good thing.

Who won? George Smith or the rest of the faculty? Did he bring the people in with tenure?

No, he did not. They got tenure earlier than some of the others, but—. That's pressure that still exists; I made an exception when I was vice president. The best qualified person for chairmanship of internal medicine just could not be convinced—he'd had tenure for twenty years at Ohio State, and he just would not come without tenure, and I finally got talked into a contract in which he came with tenure. It was not a mistake in that instance, but it was a compromise with principle that I wouldn't like to make very often!

Who was that?

Ernie Mazzaferri. And I'm very glad I did, actually, and now I think Ernie wouldn't—knowing what things are like, he wouldn't have insisted on it at all. But it was something at the time.

And several others wanted the tenure, and we talked them into coming without it [laughs].

I've heard arguments from people various places around campus, those who oppose the Medical School, and say, "Well, it takes too much money." And then there are those, too, who say, "Well, yes, but the Medical School sends all those students and makes them take liberal arts courses and keeps the enrollment up in these courses." How do you feel about that?

Well, I think that isn't really true that the Medical School does much supporting of the rest of the University. The Medical School per se with its enrollment of, what is it, forty-

five students per semester, something—or per year—so that the total enrollment is a hundred and fifty, something like that— (well, maybe—no, it would be more than that now with the four-year school). But anyway, most of what they do in the Medical School, they do in the Medical School. The premed business with the two-year program, the Medical School did sort of supervise premedical training and did the advising there. But with the four-year school they've given up most of this supplementary kind of program, the health sciences thing. And this is all being done now in other ways insofar as it's being done. They've retained medical technology and speech therapy in the Medical School, but the other things are all handled outside the Medical School.

So, I don't think really that one of the Medical School's advantages is its populating the rest of the campus. I think the research that's done there is a stimulus for the rest of the campus and helps, and I think the cooperation that occurs between the Medical School and the rest of the campus is frequently useful—sharing of equipment and things like that, and it's one of the advantages of having the Medical School part of the University rather than a kind of separate entity.

And I think on the whole, the Medical School is as valuable to the state—I think it's doing a good job. And if we can afford it, it's a very good thing to have. But medical education is expensive. I think I could teach students English if I had a three-and-a-half-to-one student-faculty ratio! [Laughs] But the requirements—I mean it's just one of the facts that the appeal of medical training is more immediate and more real than almost any other kind of education we have today. If people are sick or expect to be sick or fear being sick or might be sick, doctors are the most important

things around. And so the appeal is there—the public appeal, and maybe rightly so.

But they do have a ratio of three and a half to one? And we are talking about increasing it on the rest of the campus twenty-five to one or twenty-two to one.

Twenty-two to one for the rest of the campus. This is partly because the Medical School has the most effective pressure of any kind of academic discipline. The American Medical Association simply, through its accreditation groups, simply says, "You will have a three-and-a-half-to-one ratio or we'll close you up." And they can do it. If they cut off accreditation, it makes the school almost useless, and they aren't playing when they say they'll do it. And they've managed either to—I don't know how frequently they do actually do it, but their bluff is terribly successful. It is a bluff because they just say, "That's the way it is, or we'll cut it off."

And it works better than any of the accreditation groups. The Engineering group is the ECPD [Engineers' Council for Professional Development] or whatever it is (I never can remember the—). But anyway, the Engineering accreditation group is also pretty firm and works fairly well, and the Business group is fairly firm. But the Medical School simply establishes these criteria, and they insist on them, literally. And it gives the administration of the school, of course, a tremendous amount of pressure also. They simply have the word from the national accreditation group that "you do this, or..." and they go to the president and then go to the legislature, and it's [chuckling]—and it's hard to do anything about it. The Nursing has a kind of seven-and-a-half-to-one national accreditation requirement, but they can

manipulate and work around it and put on teaching loads and this kind of thing and keep the accreditation under pressure. And it's not totally fair that they get pushed, and the Medical School doesn't.

At one stage—I don't know what the current attitude of the budget office is now—but at one stage we did have agreement from the budget office that Nursing and Medical School would not be counted in establishing the ratio for the rest of the University because if we had them at three and a half to one and seven and a half to one, but had to absorb them in order to make the twenty-to-one or twenty-two-to-one quota, it would really raise that quota still more. But I don't know whether they now are separate or not. Medical School probably is because it's a separate budget, but I don't know about Nursing. It may change from time to time, too.

[I know that there was an incredible rivalry between the north and south over the establishing of the Medical School.. Did that affect the faculty here?]

Curious, I don't remember much about that. I can't remember a split among the regents even—I suppose there was one. And I guess it was established before the recounts on the reapportionment on the Board of Regents, so that probably the northern campus still had [chuckling] more representation on the board.

It was just before the reapportionment in 1970.. I think the north pushed very hard; I think George Smith and—.

Yes, to get it through before—. And the south kept, of course, always talking about evening things up by having the law school, and that still is talk that goes on. I haven't heard any of it in this session of the legislature [1981]. Two years ago there was a good deal of talk about a study, and there was someone who had

put up some money for a study of a possible law school; Bucky Buchanan was pushing it very hard. I don't know what happened to that; I guess it just sort of died away maybe. There was a report that got some publicity and which was not really very favorable to the establishment of a law school. No, I just don't remember. And that's very recent.

It seems like that would be so absurd with the Judicial College and the law library here.

Oh yes, it would be utterly silly, but that doesn't mean it wouldn't happen! [Laughs] No, it makes no sense to establish a law school down there. I don't think it makes much sense to establish one here either at this stage, but certainly it makes more sense here.

I think one thing that might occur here, and that does make some sense to me, is working out at least a kind of cooperative master's degree in judicial-something with the National Judicial College. The college has been interested sometime in working something out, and I did do some work on it with a consultant that the college had a couple of years ago, and it looked feasible to develop something of this sort. It would involve some work in courses on the campus and some work just in the Judicial College, and the University could offer some kind of master's degree—not a law degree, of course. But this would be a master's degree mainly for people who already had a J.D. and were interested in some kind of broader degree with some, oh, perhaps some political science or some history, or maybe even some English involved in the award of the degree. And Dean [Ernst J.] Watts has been much interested in it, and it may still work out. That would not take the place of a law school, but it would I think make the ties between the University and the Judicial College closer, and it might make some sense.

It sounds like a good idea. Something to bring the two, as you say, closer together.

Yes, and it would give the Judicial College a little more academic status, and it would also help the University, I think, in broadening it's appeal a little bit in some ways.

Who were some of the other people who opposed the Medical School at the start? And was it primarily because of the cost?

I honestly can't remember. There was not a lot of opposition, but it was mostly faculty members who—well, not long before that, for example, Stanford had been in real trouble because of medical-school costs, and it had hurt the humanities departments. I actually can't remember anybody else specifically. And it was not a violent or strong-cause kind of opposition; it was simply a matter of some people voting no and speaking against it, and some voting for it, and the majority was certainly for it. But there were a few of us, and I can't really be sure who else it would have been. I'm sure there were some in the English department who thought it was not a good idea, and probably a scattering in history and social sciences, philosophy. And our concern was just that—well, a combination of thinking we didn't need it all that badly, that it was going to cost too much to justify what we were doing when we had so many other needs, and that it was not going to accomplish what the legislature had been convinced it would accomplish.

And that, I think, remains to be seen, but I'll be surprised if we get large hordes of doctors going to Pioche and Pahrump and so on to do it. Although we were down in Caliente a couple of weeks ago, and did run into a young doctor who had gone back to Caliente to settle. And he had gone to University of Nevada Medical School and then had gone to

Alabama Medical School, I believe, and gone someplace—but he'd gone back to Caliente and was practicing there. And so at least in one instance the scheme was working! And [chuckling] it may work in others.

Do you think that the legislature would go so far as to cut off funding for the Medical School?

Oh, I think that's very unlikely, unless we hit a real crisis. The Medical School is going to become more and more expensive, and there are going to be more and more worries about how much medical education costs; there will be more people looking at the salaries of the Medical School faculty and observing how much higher they are than those of the rest of the institution, that there are lots of professors who make more than the president of the University or more than the governor, and this legislators will look at. So all that sort of thing will be coming along.

But Medical School is very popular in the state, I think, as an institution. And it may run into some difficulties in its funding when the total bill comes in, but I think there's no likelihood it will be cancelled; it would not be politically sound to drop it. And I don't think it'll move to Las Vegas either (that's another thought).

And we do hear that every now and then ever since 1960s.

Well, there are some reasons—one of them is that the opportunities for working with the hospitals in residence, the opportunities at present are much better in Las Vegas than they are in Reno, and cooperation between the hospitals and the University has been much greater. On the other hand, it's possible that if the Medical School were really down there so that the same economic threat that bothers

some of the doctors in Reno bothered the ones in Las Vegas, then the cooperation might be not quite so enthusiastic.

And in recent years I can't really tell you much about the development of Nevada Southern, except that it obviously has become a respectable institution now. It's as large as UNR, which doesn't mean anything, but it also has developed the library, which was impossible for several years. It's got a new reorganization; it's got a faculty senate that's active; on the whole, it's made a complete shift, I think, from the earlier days. The faculty are interested in research now, and they're doing some research, and it's a good faculty on the whole—much changed from the earlier faculty.

Tell me about that.

Well, the early faculty, as in any institution, I suppose—it developed slowly; there's no reputation—it is hard to get good people to come, so that the early faculty was a kind of mixed bag: some very competent people, some people who had got into one or another kind of jam in Reno and had been sort of banished—there were several of those. Since a lot of the recruiting was done through the departments in the Nevada campus, some of the people tended to be those who didn't make it through a committee on the Reno campus, but were still in the file, and since nobody was really doing any careful search job, it didn't get done, and they just picked those; so that a large number of the faculty had not finished Ph.D. '55, were in between and—not that that necessarily lowers quality, but it, at least on the surface, was something observable. And quite a few local people were still teaching part-time. And there was virtually no scholarship going on in the usual sense, so that the faculty was pretty much

confined to undergraduate teaching, and for that matter, still is, and probably—well, if the state's got any sense, it won't try to build two graduate schools in the state. As you know, one of the major problems is with the library, and we can't afford one good research library, let alone two. And that certainly would be required if Las Vegas does start duplicating the UNR's graduate programs.

In the early years there wasn't even a full four-year, degree-granting program.

Well, not at the very start. At the start it was really just a kind of extension branch is what it was, offering mainly freshman and sophomore courses, a few of them. I don't know how soon it developed four-year courses; I just can't remember. I think it was, oh, certainly not until the late fifties, I think. It became more or less autonomous only when we put in the chancellor-system arrangement. And from that time on it really ceased to have any connection with UNR.

I know there were complaints about their lack of autonomy.

Oh yes, that was it all along. Well, one thing that occurred was that the departments were really subsidiaries of the departments here, so that I was chairman of the English department, and that meant that technically the English department and the English people in Vegas were under my chairmanship. Well, that worked out fairly easily just by accident because Jim Dickinson was there, and I just sort of assumed Jim would take care of things, which he did. Although technically, I think I had to sign papers and recommend staff and all this kind of thing, as it developed. But it was so small that it was not a great handicap at the time. And they used the same

syllabus we did, I remember, and usually the same textbooks. And they did that partly because there weren't any books in Las Vegas practically. They did work on getting some, but it was a slow haul.

Now we have so much of this north-south rivalry. Was that beginning to develop, say as early as the fifties?

Well, in a way it was different, but in a way it was the reason for establishing the Las Vegas school. The public concern for having put the pressure on, and the threats were that if we didn't do something, there would be bills in the legislature to start a new university, and the proportion of Las Vegas legislators was getting big enough that that was kind of scary, you know, if somebody threatened to go to the legislature. And this isn't literally what happened, but it was one manifestation—goes to the legislature or recommends that the University budget for that year would be diverted to building a new institution in Las Vegas. Now that's the kind of thing that this legislature isn't irresponsible enough to do completely, but we're getting threats of variations on themes like that. So that was the reason originally for getting something established in Las Vegas.

When we talked about Las Vegas for the first time you mentioned Maude Frazier.

Well, yeah, that was part of the whole business. Maude Frazier was in the legislature, was much interested in education, was much respected, had been in the public schools for a long, long time, and she was the one who was on the same side proposing, would some legislative action be taken in order to get a branch or something started in Las Vegas. So that one of the things I remember we did do in that week was go see Maude Frazier and get

her ideas and make peace with her insofar as that was necessary—it turned out it wasn't a problem. But we did do that, at least.

What was she like? You said she was "sane," at least.

Yes, she—gosh, I can't remember well enough to say much about it. I remember her very pleasantly as a nice lady. She was fairly old at the time. She had been retired from teaching and then had been in the legislature, and I think had retired from the legislature, too, but was still pretty influential in the area. No, I can't come up with much about her personally. I remember that she knew what she wanted and what she was doing, and she was very calmly forceful about it. And she, I think, was respected by the legislators quite a lot, which was one of the reasons for wanting to see her [chuckling]—see what we could do about it.

[I suppose we could go ahead and start with President Miller, if you like today.]

Well, there was some controversy over the search when [N. Edd] Miller came as chancellor for the campus and Armstrong moved into the presidency. But I can't remember the details of it. Somebody, though, leaked the names of the candidates, and there were problems attendant on the committee's activities, but I suppose there always are when committees operate on [chuckling] searches.

And Miller did almost immediately create a favorable impression. People liked Edd. And he was friendly and had a—again, like Armstrong, had a reputation as a teacher and a scholar, so he was respected by the faculty, which helped a good deal. He was a very hard worker; he used to show up on the campus five and six o'clock in the morning and would go down to the snackbar and get coffee around seven or eight. But he did say that he could do his work before the phones started in the morning, and he did.

This is one of the curious facts, I have never thought there was any point in getting

up early in the morning, but I will say that when I was in the vice president's office, I discovered that one almost had to get there early if he was going to get anything done during the day before the phone rang. And so Edd did start early.

He was a kind of easygoing administrator in a way. His tendency was to listen to all sides and to please people, and he was ultimately criticized for not making decisions fast enough. I think I mentioned that that's always a criticism of an administrator. But in some ways Edd was guilty; he let things pile up rather than making tough decisions. He got criticized ultimately by some members of the Board of Regents, not because he didn't make decisions, but because he didn't make the decisions they wanted him to make, which is a quite different matter. And some of those involved the sorts of questions that you've reminded me of in the outline.

One of those was a kind of semi-sit-in in the early seventies—a number of blacks who were protesting that they didn't have office space, as I remember, in the Union

building—a kind of trivial matter really. But the press, of course, got hold of it, and the regents got interested, and Edd refused to fire the students out of hand, which some of the regents seemed to think was—what was needed was a firm hand, and you don't give these people any leeway, and then you don't have problems. And the whole thing got magnified a good deal, and as a result of that, the board or at least a couple of members of the board (as I remember, it was mainly Mel Steninger and Bill Morris) did make noises that got into the press and partly got to the board meeting—made noises about seeing that Miller was going to be fired soon.

This got a reaction on the campus almost immediately, and although there were some supporters for firing Miller, there were, oh, a number of people who supported the regents' position (a number of people on the faculty—there were quite a few others who did not). And there was a faculty meeting called. I can't remember now how it got called, whether it was officially an AAUP meeting or whether it was just an open faculty meeting. But anyway, there was a faculty meeting; it was well attended, and several of us spoke either in favor of Miller or in opposition to the regents—or to those regents. And the result was a fairly strong faculty protest, which the regents did heed, and Edd Miller stayed on. I can't remember now who all was involved in getting that meeting organized—[Harold] Kirkpatrick, who was I think dean of Arts and Science at the time, and I remember— oh, I've lost her name suddenly—professor of education, woman, retired and on the post-retirement appointment—.

Rosella Linskie.

Rosella was very active in organizing that meeting, I recall. And it did cause some furor

on the campus, and I think it did not make Miller happy. He had earlier been given some nationwide attention, which you probably heard of.

During some of the riots in Wisconsin and Berkeley and other places, at about that time, the students on the Nevada campus got a notion of organizing a day of support for the president. And it was an interesting idea, and obviously a very good press idea.. I don't know who all was behind that among the students; I don't know who thought it up, really, but it was actually managed almost entirely by students—I don't think there were any faculty pushing it. And I can't remember the date of it, but Edd came on the campus at his usual early hour and found a big banner that said, "N. Edd Miller Day" [1970]. And he discovered then that the students had arranged a trip for Edd and Nena Miller to go to San Francisco that day, and they had a kind of parade and a celebration and balloons and various other things. And it made the national press, of course, as one campus where the students loved their president and this kind of thing [chuckling]. And it was a very good idea, and it made Edd feel good, with good reason. It was before the black student affair which got him some criticism from the board and the board's attempt to fire him and so on—it was before that (I can't remember when exactly).

And of course, part of what had bothered the Board of Regents was the residue of the Adamian affair (and I'm sort of going out of order now); that apparently, has been settled finally just a few months ago. For some reason or other I was not on the campus at the time of the Adamian parade, and I don't know why. I can't remember whether I was on leave for a semester or what I was doing, but at least I was not teaching at the time of the Governor's Day business in 1970. And of course, I was around town, though; I'd heard various stories

about it. They were all sort of unpleasant in a variety of ways.

Interestingly, the Nevada campus as campuses went, was very calm all through the period of supposed student unrest and student radical action. There was very little student radicalism going on. The students remained pretty conservative and the faculty also. But there were a few of these flare-ups, and one of them occurred on so-called Governor's Day, which was an ROTC celebration and which occurred at a rather unfortunate time; almost I think it was simultaneous with the bombing of Cambodia. I think that was the problem. And so there was naturally quite a little reaction on the campus among students who were protesting the Vietnam War, and some faculty who were pushing that.

Paul Adamian was a young instructor in the English department. I think I had actually recruited and hired him at some stage when I was the chairman of the department. And he turned out to be a very good teacher, but he did not, as so many people don't, have his degree quite finished and did not finish it on the schedule when it was there. so I remember that I voted against his tenure on the grounds that he had not completed his research and scholarly work as much as he had promised to or as much as we thought he should. But he was a well-liked and a good teacher, and he was granted tenure just before this affair on Governor's Day, so that he was a tenured assistant professor.

And on Governor's Day—nobody can reconstruct exactly what happened; the stories I heard, or what I heard of it were all secondhand. According to Adamian, the thing that caused most of the trouble was as the governor's car came into the parking lot, according to members of the Board of Regents and those who opposed it, as the governor's car came on, Adamian jumped

on the running board or jumped on the side of the car and tried to stop it, tried to hold it back, and yelled at the governor or the governor's driver or someone, and this was regarded as bad. According to Adamian, he did do this, but he did it because there were three or four students lying down in front of the car, and he was suggesting that they not run over them. Well, I don't know what was really true; I suspect a little of each. I suspect that Adamian did yell fairly loudly, I suspect that there were some students lying down in front, and probably the governor's car would not have driven over them anyway. But anyway, that was the first part of it that caused trouble.

And then in the stadium, at some stage or other, a bunch of students—what happened in the stadium was a kind of review of the ROTC corps; that was the standard Governor's Day procedure. And apparently at some stage during this, a group of students allegedly led by Adamian ran across the field and made noises and were disrespectful of various things, including the flag, I guess. I'm told that one faculty wife stood up in the stands and yelled loudly, "Kill him! Kill him! Kill him!"—which I mention only as an indication of the sort of temper of the whole affair. A number of other faculty members were accused of various kinds of crimes during the day. Apparently several of them tried to calm things down, and this was regarded as bad by some of the regents. But the whole thing finally focused on Adamian, and he was subjected to disciplinary action and I think—no, I think was not suspended, maybe, but there were hearings scheduled and all that kind of standard procedure. And Adamian stayed on, then, until the hearings were there.

Well, I think Adamian's conduct after the Governor's Day thing was really quite reprehensible. He did conduct his classes

mainly as defenses of his own behavior and his opposition to the Vietnam War. And he made speeches pushing the whole thing. And I think that his conduct after the hearing or after the Governor's Day thing probably may have been grounds for dismissal—I don't know. But what happened was that the regular University procedures were followed; a hearing committee was appointed (I think Tom O'Brien was chairman of it maybe). And the committee heard witnesses and investigated as best it could what had happened, did make a recommendation to the president that Adamian be reprimanded or censured—whatever the term was, but that that should be an end of it. President Miller accepted that recommendation, concurred in it, and passed it on to the Board of Regents. And the Board of Regents seemed to me to act quite unwisely—the Board of Regents immediately refused to accept the recommendation and fired him. And Adamian sued.

Well, the suit dragged on and on. It seemed to me that the University didn't have a chance on this suit. And, oh, several years later—I think it was after Milam; yeah, it was after Milam was here—Adamian's attorneys did propose settling it out of court with a relatively modest sum. That is, it involved some back salary but not very much. And it seemed to me and I think to Milam, as he looked at it objectively from the outside, it seemed to both of us that we better jump at this chance to settle it out of court, that we didn't have a chance to win it in court. But the board again refused to accept that recommendation, and it turns out we were wrong, and the [laughing]—the suit did go against Adamian, and the firing of Adamian was upheld. But it seemed to me that he did not do anything on Governor's Day which warranted the removal of a tenured professor

from a staff position. He did a lot of things, I think, afterward, in connection with it maybe that did, and I thought his scholarship did not warrant his tenured appointment. But as frequently happens, I think he was fired for the wrong reasons, and [chuckling] it happened to stick.

That whole thing caused quite a lot of controversy. Oh, there were groups collecting money for Adamian's defense on the campus. Quite a lot of money was collected from faculty members to pay the expenses of his defense but not nearly enough. Charlie Springer, who was his attorney, managed to do most of the work, I think, without any compensation. Adamian had some personal troubles at the time, which probably contributed too—he had a divorce either just before or at about that time, which he was upset about. So it was a difficult business.

Both of those things, though, did contribute to the fact that Miller became increasingly, I think, uneasy in his position. There was, as I mentioned earlier, always faculty opposition—some of it, not a significant amount. And when the offer came along to go to Maine, he did accept it.

And it was not, as it turned out, a very happy time to move to a place like Maine. The budget problems there turned out to be even worse than they were in Nevada, and Edd left there after—I think he was there three, four years, something, then took a short-time, temporary job in Florida, and is now chairman of the speech department in—was it Western Kentucky or Eastern Kentucky? I can't remember which—it was one of those—and is, so far as I can tell, very happy there and doing what he finds pleasant and attractive. I just noticed something else that I was reminded of up here when we were talking about the things during the Miller years—of the student revolt years. One of the fairly

amusing kinds of furors was a poem written by a fellow named—oh, I lost his name; I had it just a minute ago—Dave Phoenix.

Well, it was a fairly amusing thing. (I notice you've got Fred Maher's name there, too;* I'd forgotten about him.) But anyway, Dave Phoenix was a reasonably bright, young kid in—I guess he was a teaching fellow in the English department, working on a master's degree. And for his final examination, for reasons it's hard to explain, he distributed (I don't know whether it was the only question, but it was a question)—he distributed to the class a poem that he had written himself and asked, I guess, for comments on it or criticisms or something. And that seemed to me a very gauche sort of thing to do, regardless of the quality of the poem—I wasn't concerned much about that. But you don't— well, I guess I used to, when I had a stronger stomach, sometimes as an exercise give an introductory literature class three or four poems anonymously and include among them a poem I had written in high school, and the worst poem I could find by a sentimentalist, and then a couple of good poems, and discover almost inevitably that the terrible poem got rated first and mine second, and then the two good poems last. And I got over that just because I couldn't stand it [laughing]—as an indication of how useless the whole semester had been! But I don't think that's what Phoenix had in mind—I think he was presenting this as a good piece of literature that they were to comment on.

And the trouble, however, that the public found was that the poem included a considerable number of four-letter words and various other things. I can't remember anything about the poem now, except that it was the kind of thing designed to make people like Jim Gibson in the legislature very unhappy. It came to the attention of one

Emerson Titlow, who was a representative from I don't know where— Yerington, maybe, someplace down there—Hawthorne, maybe— whose daughter I had in class, as a matter of fact. But she never seemed to be worried much about what we were—had been—.

But Titlow got hold of the poem, and the ironic thing about it was that immediately Phoenix got infinitely more publication of that poem than he'd ever got on anything else he wrote [laughing], and it did not really deserve all that attention. But I remember that it was circulated in the legislature, and people would tee-hee behind their hands, and I'm not sure; I never read it, actually! But it was objected to widely, so we ended up having to defend Phoenix, and it was fairly difficult to do because the poem was not a very good poem. But anyway, we managed to keep him from being fired, and his poem got great circulation. One of the alumni officers, Jack Swobe, who's I think dead now—but Jack Swobe got copies of it made and distributed them at homecoming—a football game—for reasons that I must confess escaped me at the time and still do [chuckling]. But I guess the idea was to show what the University was coming to and getting alumni support to get rid of this cancerous growth that we had. But anyway, he was some concern.

As I remember, one of the ironies was that old [James] "Slats" Slattery was one of the people who was outraged by this. And Slats had one of the foulest mouths of anyone [laughing], I think, I've ever known. He [chuckling] was kind of funny with it all, but for him to be upset about students being exposed to this kind of language was one of the greatest of all ironies. He was upset, too,

*On prepared outline

about Fred Maher. That was a slightly different story, but again it was one we had to defend him from—.

The charge on Maher (who was another teaching fellow and a very quiet and unassuming fellow) was that he had said something, “fuck,” in class, I think, was the charge against Maher. And again, I don’t know which legislator had heard this in various ways. And Maher, of course, couldn’t remember really whether he’d said it [laughing] or not in class, but he did remember that a lot of the students were likely to say various things in class that would seem unconventional to the others. Maher was a kind of hippie type, but not a wild hippie type; he just preferred to wear sandals and I don’t think he even had—he didn’t have a beard, I remember, and the hair wasn’t particularly long. But still he tended to let the students say anything they wanted to, and he, I think, probably was quite a good teacher. He managed to get the students’ confidence and be one of them.

Well, anyway, I think there was some kind of hearing on Maher. And one of the real problems was that we have never worked out a way of classifying graduate teaching fellows, you see. Are they students, or are they faculty? So unfortunately, none of the rights of either group applies to them, but also none of the disciplinary procedures applies to them, so it’s always very hard to know what to do about a teaching fellow [laughing] when he’s in trouble. You can’t apply faculty discipline code very well, and—. So there was that problem with Maher. And again, it got itself resolved, and he stayed on. I don’t know what happened to either of those kids. They were both pretty bright. And I think Maher was around here; I think he got working with the welfare group or something, and it seems to me I saw him a couple years ago still here.

But those were both the kinds of things that happened particularly in periods in which you have a kind of stress, and which can get blown out of proportion very quickly and can manage to keep attention from the real issues for a long time. They always seem to surface during a legislative year or something of that sort, so that the legislation has something to talk about, rather than whether we should provide educations for students in the state. Raggio, I think, was one of these people who got upset about it, though. And Bill can be very self-righteous when he gets to thinking about it. But I can’t remember how to it—well, except that it was—you know, it’s always a talking point for a campaign—your going to clean up the bad situation. And poor Phoenix, nobody criticized him at all for the bad teaching (which I think it was), which I thought was a much more serious crime than them using four-letter words! [Laughing] [Maybe that’s because no one recognizes bad teaching.] Well, I’m sure that’s right, but it was. It seems to me there were some other things like that in those days, but I can’t think what now. Be surprised if there weren’t.

I remember when I first came here, I walked into trouble almost immediately. One of the very first things I ran into was a censorship thing with John Moseley. Becky Price was hired as an instructor in English. She was—I think had just finished her Ph.D. at Yale, and Becky was a very bright girl. I saw her not long ago. She’s teaching at Sacramento. I don’t know whether it’s college or university now, but Sacramento State—teaching part-time; I think she’s married and partly is staying at home. But Becky came out completely naive about the Wild West with the notion that she was coming to Reno and mostly going to meet lots of men and have a gay social life. And it didn’t work. After spending all the years she’d spent in the Yale library doing her thesis

on the eighteenth century, which was very good—. But Becky also, without realizing the sophistication level of her students, assigned *Ulysses* as one of the books. And I think it was a freshman, maybe it was a sophomore course, which was probably a bad choice just because the students weren't up to it.

But anyway [chuckling], the president hit the ceiling. What did I mean letting this woman teach that dirty book in class? Everybody knew that was a dirty book. Did our library have books like that in it? I said they did. We went round and round, and I won that one, finally. I pulled out the—I can't remember now—who did the famous decision on James Joyce as not being pornographic? But there was a Supreme Court decision on Joyce, and I pulled that out and made him at least look at the start of it and made him confess that he had never read any James Joyce or never seen anything [laughing], and ended by not only letting her keep the assignment (although it was a bad assignment, I think), but also keeping the book in the library.

There was somebody else that I had a long censorship thing: it was one of the early years—an editor of the *Brushfire* did a story—. What was his name? I've forgotten the name of that kid. But it was all very complicated. The story involved a couple of young people and the—. It wasn't a bad story in a way; it was certainly not a pornographic story. But it was a story about a young man and a girl, and he took the girl off for a weekend, this kind of a childish sexual experience of both of them; and it turned about the girl having her menstrual period during the time. And it was psychologically, I think, kind of an interesting story. And you know, nothing pornographic about that kind of thing at all—maybe a little tasteless or a little uncomfortable, but it was very—. But the kid was just deadly serious about this story, you know. He'd worked

on it, and it never occurred to him that he was writing a dirty story. This was a terribly serious story. But, oh boy, aid things hit the fan when it was Out!

And I can't remember; I think Charlie Armstrong was president then. And Charlie was—I'm almost sure that's right—I wrote a long defense again. That was good; I wish I could find that. I remember that now as a very good statement about pornography; I was kind of proud of it. [Laughs] But anyway, Charlie accepted it and agreed, and that was an end of it. And he—Charlie—that's one of the very good things about him. He fought off the buzzards who were after the University for it and defended the kid's right to do the story. Again, not a totally successful story, but you know, not a story that was going to hurt anybody or upset anybody or—certainly not pornographic in any way.

But that's always a kind of problem with the English department, I guess, now that I think back on the number of those that we have had over the years [laughing]. Usually, though, the administration has backed the department, I think, on those, which is not always true, in that Moseley's original one was an exception that he backed down. I think for the most part the presidents and the other administrators have been fairly sympathetic to the rights of freedom of speech or whatever are involved.

Jim Anderson, who had been vice president, did take over as acting president for a year, and I think was not a candidate for the presidency. I can't remember whether he ever let his name be submitted or not, even. But he was not one of the leading candidates for the presidency after his year as acting president.

Jim was very easy to work with, I thought. I don't think he had a lot of impact on a statewide basis or the University as a whole, but in an acting position it's pretty hard to.

And I found him a very good president to work with I was dean of Arts and Science at the time, and mostly he simply allowed the deans to take care of the colleges as they wished, which always makes it easy to work with the president [chuckling]. And so that did work.

The search, then, for a replacement—I think in some ways that search was the most clearly a kind of Universitywide search that we ever had. That is, the committee did have representatives on it from all segments of the University community—alumni, students, staff, as well—and it did conduct a nationwide search and a very effective one, I think. Faculty members flew to the campuses where the candidates were working to get an opinion there on how they were regarded. And there were a number of good candidates of different sorts from all over the country who were there. I can't remember now who they were, but there were interviews here and interviews with the deans and with the student body and with the faculty, generally; and Milan was selected from that group of candidates.

For one reason or another, Max was perhaps more controversial than most of the presidents. I never have been quite sure why, but a great many of the faculty found Milan hard to talk to or found him unfriendly almost. I never did, and a lot of other people never did. But there was a kind of general feeling among the faculty that he was not responsive and not friendly. And that was a part of a kind of problem he had. The other difficulty, of course, was that in many ways Milan was a stronger, more positive president than either Miller or Anderson had been before him. And he did not simply say to deans or other administrators, "You do what you please, and I'll rubber-stamp anything." That is, he did take some positive steps, and in that process he did step on some toes.

And a few of the colleges—well, particularly a college like Agriculture which had become used to the notion that it was a little empire unto itself—colleges like that were not happy. And the result was, of course, a gradual developing of these antagonisms, so that ultimately' the Board of Regents, or some members of the Board of Regents, for the same kinds of reasons, did decide that they didn't like Milan, or some of them didn't. Those reasons varied a good deal [with] the board members, and I guess I can only guess about the kinds of politics that went on there in the Milan firing, but there was a lot of maneuvering going on.

[James "Bucky"] Buchanan and [Chris] Karamanos and to some extent [John Tom] Ross (but mostly I think it was Buchanan and Karamanos) just didn't like the fact that Milan didn't, I think, show them adequate respect, or didn't toady sufficiently. I think they liked to have a president who showed them some deference and who was also palsy with them and who went along with their deals and maneuvers and political things. And Milan, more aggressively than he needed to, or with less diplomacy than he needed to, just refused to do that. So fairly early Buchanan—and Karamanos tended to go along with Buchanan (Buchanan was the board chairman)—became enemies. And that meant that Buchanan and the votes that he could muster were always there waiting to get rid of Milan.

Molly Knudtsen was never a certainty, but she was undoubtedly swayed, and her comments at the time of the dismissal confirmed this by saying that Milan was not sympathetic to the professional schools; he was concerned only with Arts and Science, which was a curiously ironic statement. Milan had been leaning over backward to try to build the professional schools, particularly

Business and Mining and to some extent Agriculture. But Knudtsen was being fed the information from the campus that he was opposing Agriculture, particularly, and she ultimately became another vote as part of the majority to fire Milan.

It was a curious business of counting votes, which is the way the board has operated fairly frequently in recent years. John Buchanan from Las Vegas was uncertain, I think, of how—uncertain of his vote until the very last minute. But I think he yielded to pressures or promises from the other Vegas regents and finally did go along with the no vote. So that Milan was fired pretty much unceremoniously—just the board met that morning, and somebody introduced a motion that he be dismissed. And a lot of people had known this was coming and were present and asked to speak. And the board made a semblance of having an open meeting in which everybody would have a chance to speak, and they would get all the information they needed and then would make up their minds in a closed session.

Well, what happened is that they got a whole series of speeches in support of Milan from—the student senate endorsed him; the alumni president was there and spoke; various faculty members and deans spoke. And the two of us, Harry Gianneschi and I, probably spoke a little louder than some of the others, and as a result later in the day our salaries were withheld for a month as a kind of slap on the wrist, which did not bother me particularly, but which did upset Harry enough that we lost a very good person.

He was alumni director and director of, oh, promotion and so on, and he'd been doing really an extraordinarily good job, had built up a whole program, and it was too bad to lose him. And it was mostly just out of partly disgust and partly fear.

And the board did, as soon as it calmed down a little, reverse this. The press jumped all over the board, of course. This was freedom of speech they were attacking, you see, so the press was all on our side. It's the best press I ever had. And the board changed its mind at the next meeting. And I remember Karamanos, who had made the motion to keep back any salary increases—Karamanos came up to me at the next meeting, his arm around me, "Oh no! You've got to get this Gianneschi boy to know I like him, I think he's fine, he's—:" Just a complete reversal from old Chris. And so—and they did, of course, restore his salary increase, but he left anyway. He had a lot of offers lying around, and he took one and did disappear.

The board was very funny and transparent about this. One of the other incidents I remember was the Milam's had scheduled a kind of cocktail party or something for the day after the regents' meeting, and Max decided to go ahead with it, even though he had been fired. Then it turned out to have a very large attendance, most of them expressing support and condolence and so on. But Bucky Buchanan appeared fairly near the middle of the party, and I remember it very distinctly because he had a date with an instructor or assistant professor in Home Economics, I think. And they came in and sort of stood in the middle of the floor, and everybody walked away from them! [Laughing] They ended up standing alone for a long, long time and finally went over to the bar and got a drink, and again nobody talked to them. But Bucky faced it out very successfully, and eventually he managed to corner people various places.

And he did get me in a corner later, and we had fairly strong words for a while, and he ended up saying, "Well, now remember, you've got to take on the acting presidency; it's the only way to pull this campus together—

you have to agree to be acting president.” And he made a great pitch for this and almost immediately went over to two or three other people and said, “Now, you go on with this acting president thing, but the one person that you’re to—that’s not going to be acting president is Gorrell, and I’ll see to that!” [Laughing] And of course, this got back to me. It already indicated that I would not be acting president because of my wife’s illness and various other things. That whole affair was strange and wonderful in a lot of ways.

Choosing a new dean of Arts and Science in 1976 was an interesting affair because it was the first time, I think, that a woman had been chosen for a position outside Home Economics and Nursing where this was traditional. But there was quite a lot of controversy over choosing Becky Stafford as dean of Arts and Science. Becky had been chairman of sociology while I was dean of Arts and Science, and I thought a very good chairman and a very good administrator. She was bright and hardworking and generally, I thought, a good person.

And on the basis of the national search, the committee did come up with two candidates—Becky and a man (I think he was a mathematician; I’ve forgotten now his name). The Arts and Science chairmen very strongly recommended the man rather than Becky, and in talking with the Arts and Science chairmen, it was apparent that quite a lot of it was not wanting a woman dean. The committee was divided but again was sort of in favor of the man. And Max and I were both faced with a kind of difficult decision. And I’m not sure—I think they were both good candidates, and I’m not quite sure why I recommended Becky over the man, except that I knew her better, and that I’ve always had a kind of feeling that when you have a sure thing on the spot, it’s a better gamble

than something you don’t know from the outside. And so I did recommend Becky, and Max agreed and went along with—and we appointed her, not without some objections from the outside, although the Board of Regents didn’t present any objections, as I remember.

And in fact later on after Milam was fired, when [Joseph] Crowley was appointed acting president, there was again a good deal of maneuvering. I stayed pretty much out of all of that, after I had said that I was not a candidate for the acting presidency. And I was at some of the meetings, but I didn’t participate very fully. But there was a lot of maneuvering; Baeppler for example, had decided that maybe he could make some points if he got Becky Stafford made acting president, and so he was working on Becky to get her to push for the acting presidency harder and promising her various sorts of things. And she was one of the candidates, of course, but was not the one who was selected by this large group of people who were in on the selection. But there were various groups pushing for different kinds of candidates. And in the end it turned out to be an agreeable decision, everybody kind of coming around to agree in the end on the choice of Crowley, who had not been the—he’d not been pushed by any group; he was in some ways a kind of compromise candidate. But the more people talked, the more people thought, the stronger his candidacy became, and he ultimately was a very happy choice, I think, because his choice didn’t really offend any of the other groups, particularly, and he managed to move into the acting presidency with almost universal support. So it really worked well.

How would you evaluate Becky Stafford’s deanship?

Oh, she was a very good dean, I think. She for one thing worked very hard, did her homework very, very thoroughly. She didn't go into meetings without having worked out the details in advance, knowing what was involved. She, I think, was a very fair dean in most things, but she also maintained fairly high standards. She started out being tougher than she finished. That is, she mellowed some in the process. But she did try not only to administer fairly and to do her work, but also to be imaginative and to develop things. And she did get quite a lot of things going, particularly things that had been sort of started and not carried through very well.

Oh, one thing she did start, I guess—I had not really done much about it but had talked a good deal about having an advisory committee, and Becky got one started with some help. But she got a committee started, and it's been a very effective group. Largely I think it's luck in the group she picked. But I went to one of their meetings just last week, and they all attend, and she's got a citizens' group that's really active and interested. And, oh, I noticed this morning in the paper that [Thomas] "Spike" Wilson is talking about the need for special appropriation for remedial English; well, Spike's on that advisory committee, and that's where he got the idea [chuckling]. And he's been a fairly faithful attendant at the meetings. But that's one of the things that she did.

She tried various kinds of reforms within the department. She had some tough decisions to make on staffing, and she made them and made people angry, but I think made them as wisely as she could. There are a few people in the college who have no use for her whatsoever, but that's not hard to understand if you—if you've—particularly, there are a couple of women who have [laughing] no use for her! But that's partly because they feel they were

badly treated (I don't think they were, really). No, Becky did a very good job as dean, and I think most of the people in the college would agree that she did. And she worked at it very hard and did a good job. She had a lot of meetings; she used to get the department chairmen out to the S-Bar-S Ranch for a kind of retreat thing every summer to talk about plans for the next year, and I think had then working together pretty effectively, and in some fairly bad years. No, I think Becky did a good job.

I guess I haven't said much about Crowley. Joe has been, I think, an extraordinarily successful president—successful in managing to keep different factions sort of at bay and to accomplish things quietly but at the same time firmly. And I think he's been an extremely good president, one who's likely to last longer than most just because he does have that kind of calmness and balance in what he does. He made a point at one of his earlier speeches about wanting to administer with a velvet hammer; I don't know that that's really characteristic of what he does, but he does simply try to do things quietly. And one of his skills is not making decisions without checking into things. He tends to try to get as many points of view as he can before he makes any important decisions. He also has the virtues of writing well and having a good sense of humor and being generally well-informed and an interesting person.

I suspect he'll make a good president for quite a long time if, again, he can avoid getting an impossible Board of Regents situation. But he's in a much better spot with the board than wisdom was, just because it's a better board, I think, on the whole. And he should have very little trouble, I think. Although he's going to hit an impossible time with the budget restrictions, and that's what's going to—I don't know whether he can weather that one or not, totally, but I should think he could.

It's interesting, too, as one illustration of his tendency toward I think real wisdom administratively: we faced a number of good candidates to take the vice presidency in my job, and they were all from the outside, and we knew several of them very well, and it came down to two. And one of the two candidates I had known for a long time and Joe had known a little bit—they were both from outside the states. But Joe and I concurred that this person, the one that we both knew, would do things very much the way Joe and I did; and Joe and I operate pretty much the same in administration, which is one reason we get along very well. And we decided this other fellow would move in, and nobody would notice the difference, that things would go on very much the same.

The other man [Richard O. Davies] was obviously more hyper, more eager to make changes, more openly gregarious, I suppose, in a lot of ways, a much more nervous, quite different person. And Joe and I talked a long time; finally we both agreed that the sensible thing to do was bring in the person to give it more variety [chuckling] and see what happened. And so he was willing to—which was a risk—it was a much bigger risk than the other. And I think Davies is working out very well, but he is different in his approaches from Joe. And I think Joe was right in wanting the contrast, but it's an indication of a kind of unselfish and I think wise attitude toward administration, generally. I don't know what else needs to be said about Joe at this stage; that's still the kind of thing most people know about.

True, but fifty years from now—.

Oh yes—. One thing that ought to be mentioned in connection with both Joe and Milam is the effect that Shelba Gamble has

had on the president's office. Max brought Shelba in largely because he was having trouble adapting an office staff that had been put together for a predecessor to a kind of new approach. They had all been around a long time. They all resented his coming in. They all had great loyalties to Edd Miller, which was fine. But they were really very hard to work with. They all had notions that they knew what their jobs were, that they knew what they were supposed to do; they were pretty much unchangeable. And I was not in the office during most of this time, but I saw quite a lot of it, and it was sort of shocking what he had [chuckling] to try to deal with as far as the office staff went.

So he did decide to get an administrative assistant, and he advertised for one, as a professional administrative assistant, which I think was needed in that office for a long, long time. Well, he did get Shelba, whom he'd known before (she had been his secretary when he was head of political science, I think, something like that). And Shelba turned out to be just an amazingly effective person in that officer and Joe depends on her just as much as Max did, I think.

But she never makes anybody angry; y she works very hard; she never leaves until everybody else has left. She can handle almost anything, and does handle almost anything, and has just been an extremely useful part of that president's office. I think nobody from the outside knows how much of the smoothness and the working up there depends on Shelba, but quite a lot of it does. And it's not just matters of keeping the president at his appointments and things like that; it's a good deal more significant than that. It's assisting in policy decisions; never doing it obtrusively, but providing the information in such a way that the decision gets done properly. And even without anybody realizing that she's actually

made the decision [laughing], and she tends to get it made a lot of the time. So she is an important part of that whole operation.

She must have had a tremendous job getting those people to work with her or for her.

Well, actually that really she never accomplished quite. That happened was that they got reassigned, and the people there now are all people—well, Joan [Metcalf] came up. Joan had been my secretary in Arts and Science, and then she'd gone over to the math department. But when the job opened up in the president's office or vice president '5, she came up and was there. And Andrea [Hillmeister], who is there, had been—I don't know what she'd been doing, but anyway she transferred in. So both Joan and Andrea now were hired when Max was president. Well, I guess Andrea was hired after that. And the people who had been there before are now happily enough assigned in other places where they're doing their jobs as they could. And the two secretaries in the president's office are doing very easily what the three of them had trouble doing before. That isn't quite true; some of the duties have been reassigned also, so it's not that.

There was, you know, such a tremendous controversy when Crowley was selected as president.

Yeah. Now let me think. I can't—[laughing]. I'm trying to think now what it was about, and I can't suddenly.

Well, he was not on the committee's finalist list, and there was a great deal of—.

Yes, that was a difficult business. The committee, to begin with, was in a fairly

difficult spot. Mary Ellen [Glass] was chairman, and she took it very, very seriously, particularly took the letter of the law very seriously. And then there were questions about people on the committee breaking the confidence of the committee, which may or may not have been true. So there were internal struggles in the committee. I can't remember now—Dick Hughs either resigned or tried to resign—I can't remember whether he did—.

He did leave the committee.

I think he did; yeah, he left the committee, and I can't remember who went on.

That was when Art Baker was—.

That's right, Art was put on from the Academic Council, yeah. I should remember these things—I did the appointing [laughing]! But that was one of the kinds of objections.

And what Hughs had done did not seem to me so reprehensible as it did to others. But Hughs had fairly early—and I think just as a matter of openness and frankness—had gone to Joe and asked to talk to him, and then had told Joe that he opposed his presidency and tried to tell him why: that he wanted somebody from the outside with more interest in business. And Joe, I think, accepted this as being a very frank, although a little strange, statement. But then, I guess, Dick told other people that he had done this, which the committee looked on and maybe rightly looked on as having revealed his attitude before any votes were taken or before the people were there. Well, I don't know what it was; I do remember now talking in great length with Dick about it, and finally agreed with him that maybe resigning was all right just because of the furor that had been created.

Then, oh, there was something about Jim Richardson and what Jim did (I can't remember now), but I know the committee was miffed at Jim, and Jim was miffed at the committee. I can't remember why now. And then there was the procedure on the committee, which I think was all done properly and honestly. But again, I think what happened is that the committee got so bogged down in its machinery that the decisions were made on the basis of a kind of mechanical checking, and Joe, who has a very meager research record, came out low down on the kind of point system rating that they were using, so that he was not among the candidates. How he was—got back on the list I can't remember, but it was a kind of illegal procedure that I remember upset Mary Ellen tremendously. But I think maybe it was pressure from [Bob] Cashell on the board that got Joe back on the list. And one way or another Cashell did insist that Joe's name be added to the others. I can't remember now quite what the machinery was; there was some kind of maneuvering so that—maybe it was just—I think he was fifth or sixth on the list, and I guess the maneuvering was only to increase the list enough to include him—that may have been what it was.

A list came out that didn't have his name on it.

Yes, that's right.

And there was a meeting between a couple of the regents—Cashell and I think McBride—and the committee (it was reported in the paper), and as soon as the next day, the list had been expanded to include three more names.

Yes, I think that's the way it worked. And again, there was some reason for this,

because at about this time there'd been all this tremendous pressure from students and from faculty and from townspeople in support of Joe, a kind of curious phenomenon that built very rapidly, in which you had this ground swell of popular support for Joe, which put the committee in a very bad spot, because the committee, working on the basis of looking at paper qualifications, had I think quite rightly come out with him fairly low on the list.

This, of course, reveals one of the real problems with committee decisions. Sometimes it works very well to look totally objectively at qualifications and have certain criteria and then apply them. And you may very well get the best candidate that way; theoretically, you ought to do it every time. But it's also true that quite frequently subjective judgments are, I think, much [more] important than that kind of objective approach on a committee makes it appear. And I think I have more and more over the years got to trusting my feelings and my subjective feelings about a candidate for a job much more than I used to. I think frequently just looking for what seems to be a good person has a lot more importance than the record always indicates. And I suppose in the end that that happened with the Crowley selection. That, plus, of course, the fact that there was a great deal of pressure on the board and the committee from public sources.

And I'm absolutely certain, because I was around, that Joe had nothing to do with initiating that public pressure. That is, he was not out, or didn't have his agents out, beating the bushes to get people to write letters or make noises. It's one of those curious phenomena, which just because he had done a good job, somebody started the talk, and it built. And it's also true that there was the natural sympathy for a local candidate over an outside candidate, which sometimes works

that way, of course, and sometimes works the opposite: if the local candidate happens to be someone who can generate a lot of opposition, it may very well [chuckling] work in the other direction, and it sometimes does.

That's interesting because I had heard a lot of suggestions that maybe Joe was orchestrating his own—.

No, I'm quite sure that none of that occurred. Oh, he wasn't stopping any of it, and I'm sure that some of Joe's friends were talking in his favor; but there was no kind of organized (at least none that I know of, and I don't think there could have been one if I hadn't known—that I wouldn't have known about) attempt to build support or to get letters or to get- -not get petitions signed—nothing of that sort was going on. As a matter of tact, I don't think Joe wanted the job all that badly at the time. He got increasingly interested in it, but it was mostly just that he had very suddenly become popular, and all the groups agreed. And it's hard to predict how and why those things work. I can't even remember the other candidates now very well—oh yes, I do now; I'm beginning to remember some of them.

It was also true, I guess, that I was not impressed much with any of the other candidates; that is, I think the interviews may have helped a good deal in Joe's candidacy because a lot of people had trouble finding another of the candidates that they were much impressed by. Now, it's not true that some of the candidates didn't have support from some of the committee and some of the other people who interviewed them, but it was far from unanimous views on the other candidates. There were almost none of them that had any strong backing from large numbers of people. And my feeling was that none of them seemed

as good a candidate as Crowley for the job. There were a couple who had better research records, but I thought were weaker in other ways. And I think there were a lot of people who shared that view after the interviews, which is all a lot of people saw. That is, the committee looked at the paper, too, but most of the rest of the people around did not look at the qualifications on paper. And so they were going almost exclusively on the personal impression, and I think that did a good deal in Crowley's favor. Several of the candidates came on very strong about their own virtues, and that turned off a lot of people. And there were two or three that I think nobody had much interest in. so it was not a clear choice.

Of course, it's been one of Crowley's advantages that after people did make all that fuss about getting him in, that it was hard for them not to remain at least supportive for a while, and [laughing] that helps. It may be that this year is the year when that'll start changing with the budget crunch and so on. At least the strong support may change.

UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION AND ADMINISTRATORS

The approach you suggest in the outline seems to me to make sense, looking perhaps at one administrative position after another. I guess I feel mildly uncertain about this, since I think I never managed to think of myself as an administrator while I was in the University—or at least always to pretend to myself that I was going to do this one more year and then go back to what I thought was more important, which was teaching and writing. But somehow I managed, I guess, to be in administration partly, all the time.

The department chairmanship is in some ways the most taxing and the most important, I think, of all the administrative jobs. It's difficult, as almost all college administration is. It's difficult because universities are different from businesses, and the administrator is always partly hired by an administration, but also a representative of whatever his group may be, so that a department chairman is responsible to the dean, but at the same time he's the representative of his department. And he's always being caught in what may be a silly order from the dean, which the department

resents and which he has to resist, or a silly motion from the department, which the dean rightly points out is a silly motion; and the chairman is then caught between whether he defends the silly motion or whether he does what the dean [chuckles] proposes. And this happens not as rarely as you might think, so that the department chairman is in that kind of bind and so is the dean.

I notice your first item on the outline is "Motives for serving as chairman." That I can recall. Almost always my motive for serving as chairman was that if I didn't, somebody else would. And that's at least more than half serious, that department chairmen, more than other administrative officers, usually are serving not because they're seeking that kind of power or honor, but because they feel some obligation to do it and are pressed to do it. And I think that's good that administrators should be there because their colleagues want them to be or because there's nobody else either eager or capable of doing it or something of that sort. I'm always suspicious of the administrator who's terribly eager to

be an administrator [laughing], which is again a difference between a university and a business, if you like.

The English department here (which I think I've talked about a good deal), but the English department here did, when I first came, represent a kind of unique opportunity and a unique situation: just by chance, almost the entire department had disappeared just before I came. Bill Holmes, whom I never knew, had died suddenly; two or three people had resigned; another had retired. So that the year I came, so far as I knew, the total department was Chariton Laird and me. And Larry had been brought out from (I guess he'd been at Idaho State just before he came here)—but he'd been brought out to be chairman and to start or build a department, and he had taken a year for postdoctoral fellowship at Yale. So he was practically new when we came out. And he had run into me at Indiana and had worked an offer from there. In the meantime, the president had also hired Paul Eldridge, although neither Larry nor I knew about that at the time. So the three of us were almost the entire department.

And we came out in 1945 and suddenly were faced with a tremendous boom in enrollment. The enrollment suddenly went from somewhere around six hundred to nearly nine hundred that fall. And most of the additional enrollment involved beginning students so that we really did have a problem with freshman English. And as I think I mentioned, we didn't have time to go out and recruit to try to get a staff, so we simply found housewives and people with some background—anyone we could get hold of—and put them on for one or two sections of freshman English and made do that way. It was not, of course, a totally successful kind of operation, and I think I mentioned some of the sorts of problems that occurred during

those early years with the temporary staff. We seemed to have had more than our share of psychotics and so on in the group that turned up. But it still kept us from getting a lot [of] people here who were not totally qualified, and allowed us to take more time in trying to recruit a superior staff.

And we did work fairly hard to try to get a staff that was well prepared, that had an interest in research, that would make the University look a little like a university. And we did have, I think, without any question, one of the best departments in the University; and it was best in the sense that it was one of the first departments that started getting faculty who were doing writing or were doing research, which was a kind of shift. I think you'll find that reflected in Jimmy Hulse's history, that about that time there was a sort of change in direction, and the University started behaving like a university—started getting faculty interested in research.

Bob Hume, who had gone to Vancouver [B.C.] for a year—he had been here earlier—had gone to Vancouver for a year, found that he did not like Canada as well as he had expected to, and did return to Nevada in 1946. He had been here a year before I came, and he'd, I think, taken Larry's place while Larry went on his fellowship at Yale. And then he had left, but he did return in 1946.

And then we did start adding to the permanent staff. John Morrison came in one of those years from Washington with—and another thing we were doing was getting people with their Ph.D.'s completed, whereas before, the department had generally not, I think, been a Ph.D. department. Stuart Daley came soon after that. He went off to be chairman of the department at—where did he go?—I think he went to Creighton from here, maybe—no, not Creighton either—one of the Iowa colleges. He was at Drake for a while as

chairman of the department—a very good teacher and a good scholar.

But the department did, I think, have a good deal to do with the shift in the direction of the University faculty. Laird was, without much doubt, I think, the most prolific scholar at least in the humanities that the University had had, and probably that's still true. He was widely recognized. Hume wrote poetry; he also had a book on Henry Adams that came out about that time. Morrison was doing translations from the Japanese some of that time and had a volume published with the Utah press. So that the department was being productive, maybe not as productive as some larger departments in other institutions, but a good deal more productive than had been common around Nevada before that.

The department did also have a good deal of influence on the campus partly because it was large—larger than the other departments, but also because the people in the department were pretty active in University affairs, which was probably one of the reasons the English department had more difficulties than anybody else in the Stout affair. We had all been active in the AAUP in pushing for more faculty participation in not necessarily administration, but in policy-making. And that may have been one of the reasons the administration frowned a little. But we—oh, I remember I was elected in a couple of years to both the—the faculty had two representatives on what was called the Administrative Council, and then it was part of another very important group at the time which I've been referring to as Faculty Welfare Committee just because I can't for some silly reason remember the name of it! But it was essentially a kind of welfare and grievance committee. I remember I was on both of those for a fairly long time.

And the whole program developed—. There were changes in the curriculum; we

revised the entire curriculum almost, the first two or three years we were here. I think I became chairman in '46 or something like that (maybe it was the middle of '46—I can't remember). Larry—one of his first ultimatums to me, I remember, was that he would be chairman the first year, but he wanted out of it as soon as possible, and he managed to stick me with the chairmanship fairly early. And I was an assistant professor when I became chairman, which was again a little unusual. Usually the chairman, or in the past, the chairman had been a higher rank. And also about that time there was considerable discussion about whether we had chairmen or department heads; the general attitude had been that we had department heads rather than chairmen, even though they were called chairmen. And that had been certainly the practice; almost all of the department chairmen had been chairmen for years and years and years, and were not eager either to give that up. And so the attitude in the English department was different there, too, in that none of us were really vying for this chairmanship or headship in order to stay with it. And the attitude in most of the departments was that it was a kind of permanently appointed headship.

Sometime during the following years this attitude changed, and I think even was formalized in some kind of code or document; the chairmanship was defined as a chairmanship, not a permanent position. And now, of course, most of the departments have by-laws which limit the term of the chairman in one way or another and provide for change and rotation. But that was not true at the time.

But I started to say we did change the curriculum fairly early, trying to develop a curriculum that would allow at one time for both an adequate major with a relatively small staff and certainly a relatively small number

of specialists in various fields, and would also allow us to do the teaching with the small staff we had. And it turned out to be a fairly good scheme, and much of the program we worked out there still survives, although it's been shifted a good deal.

And as these things frequently turn out, one of my worries about the curriculum is that it started with a very clear notion of how it was supposed to work, but it's subsequently been tinkered with so much over the years—this is perfectly natural; every new group has different ideas and different courses they want to put in it—it's been tinkered with so much that the original notion has pretty much disappeared. In other words, what we started with was the notion that the freshman year was the standard freshman English course; the second year was to be two introductory courses one an introduction to the study of literature and another an introduction to the study of language. And then the final two years were to be an extended and more clear view of different periods in English and American literature, so that the student in his junior and senior years would take, say, a course in Renaissance, a course in Shakespeare, a course in Chaucer, a course in eighteenth century, nineteenth century, twentieth century—a long historical survey. Well, that's not the only way to do it, of course, and so in later years somebody would say, "But there's no course in the novel," which there wasn't. So we got a course in the novel. There's no course in various other genres. So that we got the curriculum multiplied, but there also was enough additional staff to teach some of it, so it worked out fairly well.

And the freshman English program, of course, fluctuated over the years, as they always do. Freshman English, I suppose, is nationally the most—oh, maybe no more than beginning mathematics and so on, but I

suspect it is—it's the most controversial, most talked about of all courses. Since everybody in this country at least makes a stab of speaking English, everybody is an authority on how you should teach it. And the result is that panaceas turn up with great regularity, and these are accepted by different departments.

About the time I came here, semantics was getting big. And S. I. Hayakawa over at San Francisco State (I think he was there at the time—maybe it was—but he was at San Francisco State)—he and various others were announcing loudly that semantics would solve all the problems of teaching freshman English. And of course, semantics was useful. But everybody got on the semantics bandwagon, and it lasted for maybe a few weeks, and we pushed some semantics here for a while in the freshman English course.

Then there was a boom of working with the readers on controversial topics, and a whole group of books came out, in which you got two essays in favor of Communism and then two essays opposing Communism, and then the student wrote about them. It worked really quite well for a while, but I think those are all gone now.

There was a period of guided research that came partly because libraries got so crowded with freshmen scurrying around, and also because the files of the research papers that students were writing got so extensive in the fraternity houses, and when you got the same paper on Lincoln's assassination six times in one semester with only slight variations, it got to be [chuckling] a kind of problem both for the library and for the faculty.

So a whole lot of books came out in which excerpts on different subjects from different writers came out. For example, one that was very popular was the London Fire of 1666, and another one on the plague years. And then you got a little pamphlet that had

different articles from it, and the student simply worked from that, and it was not a bad idea because he got a notion of how to handle evidence, how he could do his footnoting and so on. And it had the disadvantage, of course, of not getting him into the library. But it had the advantage also of not getting him into the library [laughing] in large numbers, because what the students tended to do when they got in the library was not do what they had been told to do, which was try to find things, but to rush immediately to the most pleasant and susceptible of the library staff and say, "Will you do my research for me?" And a good deal of the time, they got the kind of help they wanted rather than the kind they should have I. Anyway, that was another.

Well, this whole business proceeded. Laird and I tried for a while when the pressure was on, a scheme that Larry later used in Oregon in which we tried to get the students to do their own teaching; it worked fairly well. He had three or four articles on it from the program at Oregon which they took up in some detail. And the students worked in committees and read each other's papers and so on. One of the problems was that in order to make it save any time, you had to be willing to stick with the students' criticism and not stick your nose in and redo it all yourself; otherwise, it just took more time than it did originally. So it didn't work successfully or totally. We tried teaching freshman English in some big lecture sections with small groups, and this didn't work very well and didn't save very much time.

We had English A, of course, which was the remedial program. And I don't know, the figures I keep hearing from the English department now are that some forty percent would not qualify for admissions I think we were putting about twenty-five or thirty percent in even then—into the remedial

program. We were screening them I think better than they can screen them now just because there weren't so many. And we did read papers as well as get test results on every entering freshman. We sat around for a week with everybody in the department reading themes from eight in the morning until midnight in order to get all those freshmen screened and into sections. And what we were doing was giving a no-credit course that they were required to pass before they got into the University, and this was run through the Extension Division, and they had to pay an Extension fee to do it.

This was a very unpopular program, as you can imagine. I think in a way it was logical, and I think it was right. And it did do one of the things that people say now should be done, which was put pressure on the high schools and on the—not so much the high school but the high school students and parents, to indicate that they ought to be able to read and write before they come to college. But we did have to give it up; the administration got enough pressure that it put pressure on the English department, and we had to stop it.

I don't know when—it's not so long ago. Well, it was just before—you've probably indicated when I was dean of Extension—yeah. It was just before that because one of the things I discovered when I went out to Extension in '67 was that the Extension Division had been making a nice substantial profit on the English A program [chuckling], and there was a little surplus in the English A account, which none of us in the English department knew about, and which luckily nobody out in the schools knew about either [laughing]!

But the English A program was then dropped, and as has been going on as long as I can remember, there would be a University

committee which would lament the fact that students couldn't write very well and would come up with some kind of proposal for a junior proficiency examination or for something else that was going to solve it. Almost always, however, in the end it turned out to be a kind of compromise that had not really solved anything.

And I think right now the freshman English program is probably working better because no University-wide committee is trying to regulate it so that the students don't have to spend any time but still learn. This is always the problem: the University committee makes loud noises, and then everybody on it starts suddenly thinking, "Yes, but if they do an extra semester, or if they do two semesters, it's going to cut down on the time in accounting or agriculture or whatever else it is. So let's put in a one-semester course that really is a good one and does it all!" And it doesn't work that way.

Well, that's a lot of talk about the English department, maybe. Have you thought of anything I ought to talk about?

I think that that is a very timely discussion, though, considering all the noises the legislature is making these days and what we're seeing in the courses—the students can't write.

Oh yes, that's true. I don't really know whether it's any worse now than it was or not. I think the other day we were talking about it a little bit, or maybe it was somebody else I was talking [laughing]—. But I think—it's very hard to say, first of all, whether it is much worse. The national test results are down; there's no doubt about that, but it's hard to tell from that because you don't know what the national tests are testing. The national tests I've always been suspicious of because they base their claim to effectiveness on the fact that they statistically

can separate those who do well in college from those who don't. But the kinds of things they check are likely to be trivial, I think. I think frequently what they are demonstrating more than anything else is that some students are more careful or some students are more conscientious than others, rather than whether they can really write or not.

For example, there were some samples from a national assessment test, and I think it was the Sunday Chronic 2W, or maybe it was a week ago (I don't remember), but there were some samples there. One of them was a series of sentences, and the question was "Which of these sentences is incorrectly punctuated?" Well, I read them three times [chuckling] before I noticed which one it was—just out of carelessness! And what they had was a sentence that was essentially imperative, essentially a command, and they put a question mark on it instead of a period. But you know, that's so rare an error or so unusual a thing that I just wasn't looking for that; I was carefully going through to see where they had a comma out of place or a comma missing simply, and I can imagine that students would get caught in the same sort of trap, but it isn't all that important. And the other samples were also sort of questionable matters of usage. Like and as, it seems to me, was one of them.

Well, there are a great many students who are pretty good at memorizing those usage matters but who still can't write. Now by coincidence, most of the kids who are conscientious enough to manage that are also the kids who are bright enough that they write pretty well. But it doesn't really test their writing ability. So all I'm saying is that I'm not sure that the national assessment or the SAT scores or the others are really a conclusive guide to how well students write or don't write.

And the other thing, of course, is that so much larger a proportion of high school graduates or people generally are now coming to college, and the additions are likely to be those who are less well-prepared than the others; and the result is that we get more badly-prepared students in college in all sorts of subjects, including writing. It's certainly true that there are a lot of students who write very, very badly. And I suspect that maybe the writing skills are falling off, but I've been screaming the same kind of thing for forty years, and I think it's been right for forty years. And I think I can cite a lot of reasons.

I can't remember whether Carnegie founded one—there was a high-powered commission, though, about, oh, three or four years ago that did spend a lot of time trying to assess the reasons for whatever the SAT drop was, and they came up with a very good report, except that the reasons were as numerous as you would expect them to be, and they couldn't pinpoint any one. Certainly television has an effect. If kids are spending their time looking at the tube, they're not reading, and reading is obviously one of the ways you get acquainted with language and one of the ways you learn to write. And I think everybody agrees with that, so that's one of the difficulties. It's also true that not as much writing is taught in the schools, and the reasons for that are pretty clear: if the teacher has a hundred and eighty students, there's no time for writing every day or so and getting it read; it's just physically impossible. So that that's happening—the overcrowding in the schools, the understaffing.

It's also true that teachers are not properly prepared in how to teach writing. They get their teaching certificates, and they may get them without ever having any real instruction in rhetoric or composition at all or very much in language. And so they go out in the schools,

and obviously they're going to teach what they feel some confidence in teaching, so they teach short stories and novels and not very much poetry, but a little. Not to mention the fact that I don't know how many of the English teachers, but a considerable number of the teachers of English are trained as coaches and put into English because anybody who can write and talk English ought to be able to teach it.

So all these things contribute to the difficulties, and it's very hard to say which ones do it. And you know, you get set answers all the time to the problem: "Well, why don't you just keep 'em out until they're able to write; just don't let 'em in the University if they can't write." Well, you can imagine what kind of outcry that would have publicly. It's right, I think, but it isn't going to solve the problem anyway. And so I suppose some kind of remedial program is essential, and I think it has to be done.

The statistics on the amount of salvaging you get from freshman English—from the remedial courses—are pretty discouraging. Now I don't know what they're like now, but years ago when remedial English was pretty widespread throughout the country, there were quite a number of studies on how many of those who were initially put into remedial English finally graduated. And this was used as an argument for doing away with remedial English, that it didn't salvage many, and the numbers were really pretty discouraging. On the other hand, it seems to me the fact that only, say, ten percent of the English A students ever graduated—seems to me that doesn't prove that English A is not valuable. It seems to me what they learn, they learn, and I would hope that they're better off for having that semester of remedial English than they would have been otherwise. As long as they were in the University, they were doing

something; they might as well have done something useful [chuckling] rather than just sitting through freshman English and flunking it, which they might've done.

How do you think it affects the quality of education or academic standards in the University as a whole to have these people who go out and while they're taking remedial English, they're also taking history? Well, if you can't write—.

Yeah. Well, of course that's the dilemma. And the alternatives are one: not let them in the University, which has much to be said for it, and which is more possible now with the Community College System than it was earlier. They can go to the community college where the community college then faces the dilemma, do you put 'em into remedial sections or do you put them immediately into the college transfer programs where they want to be? But it is true that the community colleges nationally have got away with much more remedial' work than the universities. They don't seem to have the same resentment on that, and it was common in California colleges a few years ago at least to have one or two or three levels of remedial English. You know, they would take maybe three semesters before they qualified for the regular college transfer English. I don't know how widespread that kind of practice still is.

But back to your student in history, the University has two choices: either he's kept out, and he has to be kept out on the basis of some entrance testing; you can't do it on the basis of grades because the grades vary so much. It's amazing how many of the students who failed the entrance test got A's in high school. And maybe they weren't totally undeserved, you see. It may have been that the course was a course in what one of the schools

called "jock lit," in which you studied Sports Illustrated. And the student may have done very well with this. And if the only quizzes on the content are "false" and "true" of the reading, then he may very well have earned that A in his English course. So that you would have to do it by testing, and students could, then, be kept out.

This has never really worked very well, that the student who—particularly if he's a student who's qualified in every other way and has a good high school record, it's very hard to keep him out of the University on the basis of a single entrance test. So that if you can't keep him out or don't keep him out, then you either put him into the freshman English program along with the history program, where he may one way or another get by in the English course; but chances are if the English course is right and he's not qualified, the English course will not help him in the things he's weak in. The English course will assume that he knows these things and will therefore be directed to other problems, will discourage him, and ultimately he'll fail the freshman English course. The history professor is likely to be more lenient, and to give him a C or a D on the grounds that if he seems to know the material even though he can't make it very clear (in his examination it's there), he'll take two or three other courses which have only short-answer examinations and do very well in those and keep his average up, and he manages to get through the University. By the time he's a sophomore, he knows where he can avoid writing papers, and he can get through all right.

So all I'm saying is that I think remedial work is practically almost inevitable in a university and probably the only solution. And it's interesting, of course, that the legislature is talking of a special appropriation for remedial English, which I guess I'm not

going to point out the ironies of this in any public way, because I think it would be a very good thing to do, but it is ironic that we're going to do away with the things that the University is traditionally more prepared to do, and we're going to put in a special appropriation for remedial work, which is—it's all right, I guess [chuckles].

It is ironic.

Well, there were reasons. [Thomas] Spike Wilson, who's pushing it, was appointed to the—Becky Stafford quite wisely, I think, put Spike on the Arts and Science advisory board, and the advisory board set up a special subcommittee on competency in writing. Maybe Spike's even chairman of that subcommittee (I'm not sure). But Elizabeth Francis brought them a batch of samples for the first writing, and Spike looked at those horrible examples, and [laughing] he's been in a state of shock ever since! So it may work that the English department will get a special dispensation for remedial English, which is interesting.

I can imagine, though, some of the things that you see in those freshman English papers.

Well, they're pretty bad, and it's really hard to know which things to get most upset about because what publicly are referred to as "basics" are not really the major problems or the basic problems even. You know, you do get these students who can't spell three words consecutively, but I suppose that's not really as basic as the fact that they just write gibberish, that they don't say anything, some of 'em. And it's hard to know which is worse, the neatly spelled paper that is sheer nonsense or the badly-spelled one that has something to say, and [chuckling] those do turn up. So it's

very hard to work it out. You know, practically it's necessary to have a little sense of how to spell the language, but being a good speller does not guarantee wisdom, by any means. And being a bad speller is not always a sign of stupidity; it may be a sign of laziness or lack of a visual kind of mind or a lot of other things. But again, the practical fact is that publicly that's what causes the furor.

I was talking to someone the other day who knew that we were doing this. She could remember when you and Laird were just about the whole English department and that it was considered one of the best English departments in the whole country, and that your graduate students in rhetoric were accepted at any college in the nation.

Well, I can't remember when the Ph.D. was introduced—'68, maybe? Along in there. It must have been a little before because I notice here I was dean of the Graduate School '67, '68, so it had to be before that because the Ph.D.'s were established at that time.

What happened there was that in the sixties there was considerable pressure to put in Ph.D.'s in the University, and several departments were eager to get them started. Geology was one; chemistry was another; physics was another, I think. The English department was not terribly eager to start a Ph.D. program, largely because we were aware of library deficiencies and some staffing difficulties, and it was before micromaterials were really as extensive as they are now. That whole shift in the availability of micromaterials is more recent than one realizes, because now I suppose University of Nevada has available more original, more early texts in most fields related to an English Ph.D. than the best research libraries in the country had when I was a graduate student.

Well, I was working in Elizabethan drama at Cornell, where there were a lot of good early editions, and I could order film of plays I didn't have from the Huntington Library or the British Museum or someplace. But now the University of Nevada library has every play published before 1700 on microcard. It's here! And [chuckling] —so—but in those days we didn't have all that stuff, and we were worried about the library.

But anyway, we did have a lot of pressure on the department, that since we did have probably a larger percentage of Ph.D.'s on the staff and more research going than most departments, if any department did a Ph.D., we ought to go along. And so we did, with some sort of bravado requirements along with it, in which we said we would do it, but with the understanding that we were to get an additional staff member and to get some money for the library collection and so on. Well, we did muscle some additional library money that way. We didn't ever get the additional staff member. But we did get the other, and we started the Ph.D. program. But at the time we did it, we did agree as a department that we would restrict specializations to the kinds of things we could do in the department fairly effectively. And one of the things we did was—well, we could do American literature, and I guess we allowed modern literature at the time. And maybe we allowed Middle or Old English, I don't know, but in a couple of instances, I guess.

But the other thing that Laird and I did was start a relatively new Ph.D. program, which was a language-rhetoric combination. And this was a relatively new idea but a very timely and a very good one. And we did simply look at the facts: that we could not possibly compete with Yale and Harvard and their libraries in Renaissance literature, let's

say, but that there were almost no programs in the country in which a Ph.D. could be turned out, who was competent in rhetoric and language. And we were right in anticipating that starting about then, the biggest, the most marketable kind of graduate work in English was going to be for directors of freshman English and for people to teach composition, that it was still true that even though a lot of graduate students, fresh Ph.D.'s, were going out and saying, "At the University of Illinois, I will teach six credits only, and three of them must be a graduate seminar," and were getting away with it (there was enough staff shortage at the time to make that possible). We were fairly sure this wasn't going to happen forever. And so we did work out a program which was a combination of some seminars in rhetoric, some seminars in language, and the dissertation could be in rhetoric or linguistics or a combination of them.

Now, part of the problem with that is that the department never totally went along with the idea, so that examinations tended still to require a considerable knowledge of English and American literature. And the people who did those degrees were likely to have to do a good deal more work than someone who simply went through the literature degree. But the result was that we did have a number of students who took those degrees, and as far as I can remember, all of our Ph.D.'s with the rhetoric-language combination got jobs and are doing fairly well. Bill Lutz is chairman of the department at Rutgers, and Bob Bentley—I don't know where he is now. He was at Flint University for a while and has published a good deal.

There were not any tremendous numbers of them actually, partly because it didn't last very long. You see, in '67 I left the department pretty much, and although I was back from time to time, well, there was nobody else

really pushing the rhetoric thing. And I did have a few students who did—in fact, I taught a rhetoric seminar just a year or two ago, I guess. But there weren't many Ph.D. students doing it, and then Laird retired, and nobody was pushing the language much. [William H.] Jacobsen and [H. Jennings] Woods were both interested in language but Jacobsen more from the anthropological point of view than its connection with literature or writing. So that the program pretty much petered out.

Interestingly, it got picked up—the same things—in other places. Ross Winterowd, for example, a friend of mine—he was at Nevada for a short time, I guess—Ross Winterowd at USC, as one example, picked up almost exactly the program we had. We talked about it a good deal at different meetings, and Ross picked up the program at USC. And two years ago, the last I'd talked with him about it or checked with him, he had more majors in the Ph.D. program at USC in the rhetoric-language program than they had in the literature program. It's been a very successful business at USC, and he's turned out some good people. And we hired one of them a year or two ago. And they had another one up this year or last—two years ago, I guess—as a candidate for the freshman English directorship here. And he turned out to be an insufferable person, so [laughing] they didn't hire him!

But now that kind of program is pretty common around the country—a rhetoric-language Ph.D. And I'm not sure there were many; I still occasionally get a telephone call: "Do you have somebody in rhetoric who might be a candidate for a freshman English job?" And we don't, but—[laughs]—but it's there. But that was one of the fairly important things that I think we did for a time.

Another interesting aspect of that was at this very earliest reorganization of

the curriculum in English, we did put in the course we called "An Introduction to Language," which ironically was my idea, since I didn't know anything about language, and I thought people ought to. But Laird, who did know about language, taught it, and the most popular book that Laird ever did was called *The Miracle of Language* and essentially came out of that early course. Well, that course got into the curriculum in the fifties or earlier, maybe even, and we had all sorts of letters around the country for information on how we were doing that course because there was again mounting national pressure to have more language and composition training for teachers; it was very slow in getting adopted. But the notion of this introductory course that all students might take was an interesting one—got a lot of attention. And then Larry published *The Miracle of Language*, which was sort of an indication of his approach. Again that's changed a lot over the years, depending on who teaches it and how.

English seems to be such a dissension-ridden department now. Has it always been like that?

Oh, no. No, I don't know what goes on in the department now. I'm not really sure what they—they seem to have one-majority votes on almost every subject when they [laughing] do it! And actually when we were there, we never had any votes; we always just talked ourselves into an agreement. And we almost never had votes on—oh, that isn't quite true. I guess, as we got bigger, there did get to be differences of opinion. But, no, they've been having difficulties lately.

One of the standard kinds of disagreements in English departments all over the country is the disagreement between those who feel that freshman English is not a proper function of an English department, that this

should be taken care of by the schools or by graduate schools or by somebody else, and that their function is to teach only a literature specialty—that's an extreme view, but it is the one extreme—and on the other, the view that freshman English is the most important function of the department that everybody ought to teach some of it, and so on. Well, that has been a problem for a long, long time, and it's not confined to Nevada by any means. I ran into a lot of it.

Oh, years ago one of the good things that the National Council of Teachers of English did in the early sixties was get a grant from the Carnegie Foundation to hold a meeting of fifty selected department chairmen at universities through the country to discuss the role of freshman English. And I was on the committee that set the thing up. And we did it sort of maliciously; that is, we picked a few chairmen like me who were interested in freshman English in one way or another—maybe eight or ten of us—but mostly we got people there who were the chairmen in prestigious literature graduate departments. And Fredson Bowers from Virginia was there, and Williamson from Yale, and I've forgotten who the Harvard chairman—I don't think Harvard deigned to send anybody. Bill Sale was there from Cornell. But mostly Ivy League schools were there and the big ten schools.

Well, it was an extremely interesting meeting; it was held in the Allerton Park Education Center at the University of Illinois. And we were there for three or four days sleeping in dormitories and talking all day. But what was really true was that this was a kind of revelation. I spent a lot of time talking to Fredson Bowers, I remember, from Virginia, and he's a great scholar, a bibliographer; I don't know how many books he's done and how many he's edited, a tremendous scholar. But it had never occurred to him to think about

the freshman English program. And it was not that he was opposed or anything of that sort; it just never occurred to him that that had anything to do with English departments. He had a director of freshman English, and he paid no attention to it and had no interest.

Well, the lesson that—or the sermon or the prophecy—we were trying to make at the time was that if English departments were to survive, they had to be fairly serious about the freshman English program because before very long, we were not going to have all these English majors who wanted to find out everything about the plays of Thomas Decker or whatever Fredson Bowers was working on at the time. And that conference, I think, was really very important in starting some different attitudes toward freshman English all over the country.

It's true that some places at that time and some places afterward were dropping freshman English. Michigan, for example, dropped it for a few years and then took it back, the notion being that if they simply dropped freshman English, all the freshmen would flunk out of the university, and then the schools would have to start teaching 'em. Well, it didn't work that way, and so the freshman English came back.

Well, what I'm getting at in a roundabout way is that this difference is one that exists in a lot of departments and has existed here for a long time—not to the same extreme—but even when I was chairman, there was a good deal of argument over what the content of the freshman course should be. Some of us (and I was included) took the attitude that the freshman English program should be primarily focused on instruction in how you write, and criticism of writing and so on, that should not be there. The other attitude in the department was that this was the only chance many students had to be exposed to literature in any

form, and therefore, it was more important to focus the course on literature, having the students write on the side. And the assumption there was you couldn't teach writing anyway, that they might as well write about literature so they would learn about something.

Well, I'm not intending that to sound as if one of these ideas is wrong and the other right because there's a good deal to be said for the literature approach. And the most common course still in the country—at least the second semester of freshman English—the most common course still is a course in which they read literature and in varying degrees write about it. I happen to think that's wrong for a couple of reasons: one of them, I think it diverts attention from the main thing, and in practice most of what's done in literature is taught as a kind of introductory literary criticism or introductory history of literature, which is worse; and the second thing I think wrong with it is that trying to get students to write literary criticism is trying to get them to do at the start a very sophisticated, difficult kind of writing, and that the students are better off doing writing that doesn't have quite that sort of specialized set of requirements, that is, most students. Now some are not; some are quite capable of doing it.

But anyway, that is a basic difficulty in the department right now. This has a manifestation in votes on personnel questions. Some members of the department feel that research and writing on composition are not appropriate for the department, and therefore, they have on some recent occasions voted no on a personnel recommendation in which there is a good deal of publication but is not the kind of publication they think is appropriate. And in other instances they have voted yes on very meager records which look as if they fitted the pattern more. So what you tend to get is that tenure recommendations and so

on coming out of the department are almost always five-four, or six-three, or something, and the result is that all of 'em have trouble later on. But that basic philosophical difference is one thing that is, I'm sure, characteristic of the department now.

And one of the—well, one of the problems I had with the department all the time I was vice president was that they worried about how to get the programs taught and so on, but at the same time, the regular staff were teaching almost none of the freshman English. And I was insisting— and the president was insisting to me even more strongly for obvious practical reasons—that we hadn't a prayer of ever getting any additional staff in English unless the whole staff were teaching some freshman course. And so we had this constant battle in which I remained firm saying, you will not get any additions [chuckling] until everybody's teaching freshman—.” And it's sort of worked out that the regular staff are teaching a good deal more freshman English. And one reason it had to be was that the number of majors had dropped off to a point in which there just was not enough to keep the regular staff busy doing literature courses if they did it exclusively, running classes with too few students. And so that remained a problem. But well, English departments have always been, I think, pretty independent, and maybe that's a good thing in some ways.

I think the department is less active in University affairs now than it used to be. There are fewer members on committees, fewer committee chairmen, fewer representatives in the senate and this kind of thing. I don't know why that should be, but I think it's true. I don't think there's anybody in the senate from the English department now; there used to be always one or two. May be some fairly active, but most of 'em I think are not—whatever

“campus leaders” mean—I think they are not campus leaders in that sense usually.

How does a chairman go about encouraging faculty members to teach freshman English?

Well [chuckles], it isn’t a matter of encouraging—. You just assign them. There’s no other way to do it. The whole business of how you operate as a chairman, and a schedule is—varies a lot with the department and varies a lot with traditions and how it’s been done.

There are some departments in which he sends out a memo to the faculty member; it says, “What do you want to teach next semester?” and then he tries to put it together. Well, this is a very nice system, and I ran into it in Finland where there seemed to be no advice or unity in the scheduling at all. And the whole administration of the University of Helsinki was—so far as I could tell, there was a rector, and he had an assistant, and then there was a registrar, and she had an assistant, and she had a great big book, and she had a bottle of ink and an old-fashioned dip pen, and whenever a student passed an important examination, she wrote his name in that book and kept a record of it; but as far as I could tell, that was the total university administration (and they had about twelve thousand students). And it seemed to work pretty well [laughs]!

There were other things obviously going on, but the scheduling, I discovered, was done simply by each professor getting a little three-by-five card. And I put on the three-by-five card, “I will lecture on such-and-such at such-and-such an hour in such-and-such a room.” And I did work out with somebody there what room and what hour it would be—that was appropriate, and I put up three of those little cards saying, “I will start at October twenty-

five,” or something, and that was the scheduling. I didn’t know what anybody else was doing, and nobody else knew what I was doing, and the students came around if they thought it would help them pass their examinations or be interesting. And some days I’d have a hundred and twenty there, and some days I’d have three there, depending on [laughing] what the subject was that was announced for the day. But it worked out very well.

Well, in a sense, some departments do almost that now. It has to be more regulated than that, of course. And faculty members tend to do the same.

I think that scheduling ought to be done from a different direction. I think the department all ought to participate in trying to decide what the schedule ought to be, that is, what courses it is essential to teach this semester. And then the department chairman, in consultation with each member, works out which ones’s going to teach. And that is the way I always worked out the schedule.

We did things like sending out questionnaires through all the classes: “Which courses do you have to have? Which do you want? Which would you need?” And we worked out a rotation of the graduate and upper-division courses and that kind of thing. But in advance we would determine, we must teach the following next semester, and then we’d put them down, and then we’d parcel those out.

And you didn’t always teach what you mostly wanted to teach or what was your favorite course. Whenever possible, you do, of course, because it makes for the best course if you’re teaching what is there. But I certainly managed the first years I was here one way or another to teach practically every course we had in the curriculum, even though I didn’t know anything about it, just because we had to do it in order to get them taught. And I

even made myself learn how to teach that introductory language course, which I had no background in at all.

And so the scheduling has to be—you can't force anybody, of course, to teach anything. If he's determined not to, he can sign up for it and do a very bad job; and the student, of course, is the one who suffers then, which is not what you want. But in general, what the chairman's job has to be is simply to get the department to see the facts of life, which is what has happened here more or less. That is, the department has, I think, come to realize that if it doesn't teach freshman English, it hasn't got much to do these days [laughing], and so it is cooperating a good deal more now. And I think that's true generally.

And it's another of those situations in which the chairman has to work between the requirements that have pushed down on him from above and the desires of his department, and it makes a very difficult kind of job, particularly if the department is not cooperative in what's going on. And that happens when you get various kinds of actions and controversy in a department, and there are some here, but maybe not forever.

I don't know that I have a lot to add about the graduate program. I was dean just for one year while Dean [Thomas] O'Brien was off doing in Washington a position with National Science Foundation. And so I was mostly not working on any innovations of any sort. I did do one thing: I published a Graduate School catalog that year. I can't remember now how that came about, except somehow or other, I found the money to do it. [Chuckles] Dean O'Brien had wanted one all the time, and he wanted one after he returned, but somehow or other the whole funding business disappeared. I guess I worked it with some NSF overhead money or something—I can't remember. And it seemed to be a good thing to have. And my

notion was that it would prevent duplication in the general catalogs. It turned out it didn't; they decided they had to have it in the regular catalog also, so it was not an efficient thing to publish them separately. But we did do that that year.

In some ways that was a very good year for the graduate program. All of those years were. There was a good deal more federal money; we had three or four federally-financed scholarships. Well, we had more than that—there were NSF training grants, and there were some other funded grants (I've forgotten what). We even had some appropriated money to provide fellowships. I think there were three or four University graduate fellowships that could be passed around. And there were, of course, still jobs for graduate Ph.D.'s in a lot of fields where there are no such jobs now. So that the graduate program was really booming through the late sixties.

In a way we have—I think the number of students, actually, has continued to rise totally. Oh, I don't know whether that's true; I don't really know what the statistics are on the graduate program now. Certainly there are fewer Ph.D. candidates around, I think, at least in some departments. In the humanities departments, English has many fewer; history, political science have fewer. It's probably true that the chemistry and physics Ph.D. candidates are—well, physics, I guess, doesn't have many either. Chemistry Ph.D. candidates are probably still up, and maybe psychology and clinical psychology and geology, but certainly they've dropped off in the humanities. And that has practical difficulties for a department like English in that there are so many fewer graduate students to teach the freshman English course. And it's in a way hard to get master's candidates to be qualified because they need at least some experience before they can take over.

It could be argued that Nevada probably entered the Ph.D. business earlier than it needed to in some fields, and that probably we're not as well qualified for graduate work as we might be in all fields, and particularly, that there isn't as much demand now. And there is, of course, talk about cutting out some of the Ph.D. programs. On the other hand, the graduate work is certainly important for keeping the quality of the faculty research going. And I suspect that most of the programs will gradually recover as the enrollment problems level off and surplus of teachers sort of levels off, that they'll survive fairly well. Some of them have been highly successful right through: chemistry is one; psychology is another; clinical psychology is another. On the other hand, both the psychology and clinical psychology programs depended very heavily on federal grants, which are gradually drying up. And there may be troubles in the future for them.

So it's really hard to know. The humanities programs survive largely because the students are subsidized through assistantships, and that's always made English programs work fairly well. But the problem with English programs now is the difficulty of getting jobs. The same is true with history and others. And in English, although there still is a demand for the rhetoric-language types, we're not turning them out, and it's very hard for Ph.D.s in modern American literature to get jobs anywhere, which is what has happened with a lot of the Ph.D. students. I don't know how many Ph.D. students there are now in English; I haven't any idea, but it's much smaller than it used to be, I'm sure. Although I did sit in on an examination just a couple of weeks ago, a local student who had been working his degree for eight or ten years, I guess, and I was still on his committee, and he did finally finish. And that was in Elizabethan drama, so

it—. But he's not planning to look for a job, I think [chuckling].

I can't imagine what he would find, unless—.

Well, if he were lucky—now it's still true that the very best students are finding jobs. It's just that there are so many more now. The year I finished my degree, so far as I could tell—and I think this was pretty good evidence—so far as I could tell, the year I finished at Cornell, which was 1939, there were two real university jobs available in the country, one at Michigan and one at Purdue. And I was runner-up for the job at Purdue and didn't get it, but in the meantime took a job at Deep Springs College where I had connections and where I decided to go just as a kind of stopgap, and also a kind of contribution to the kind of educational experiment I was interested in. And so I was there for three years. But as far as I know, there were only those two jobs available. That was the word I kept getting from the people at Cornell, who knew their way around pretty much. And at that time almost all the jobs were done or were given by a kind of agreement among the people who were in the know, and so that having a degree from Cornell really made a difference in those days because you were part of this trading back and forth scheme that they were using, but there just weren't any jobs. But there were only two of us who finished our degrees at Cornell also, so that was a different pattern. And I think the same kind of thing is still true, that a few people are getting jobs— or relatively few jobs for the number of people getting them. And that's what makes it difficult.

The Graduate School started out really almost just as a kind of paper-signing organization; it didn't really mean much. Joe Moose, who had been chairman of chemistry, sort of retired into the deanship. I'm not saying

that in a derogatory way; he just became dean a few years before his retirement, and there wasn't much graduate school there, so it was mostly a matter of working on papers and regulations and getting some of them established. And it was after O'Brien came—I don't know when he came now, really.

1960, I think.

That sounds right. When O'Brien came, he did start working on building the Graduate School and the graduate program. And of course, also this was the time when federal monies became available to promote graduate work, and it built itself, partly. But that involved a lot of new regulations—the development of the Graduate Council in those days, and ultimately the creation of a Graduate Faculty.

The Graduate Faculty has never been a clearly operative group. Originally the Graduate Faculty was just another name for everybody; you belonged to both faculties almost automatically if you were on the regular staff. And what evolved eventually was an attempt to restrict the Graduate Faculty to those who actually were qualified to teach graduate work, so that a good deal of controversy developed, oh, in the last ten or fifteen years over what the qualifications of the Graduate Faculty should be.

The most controversial suggestion occurred a few years ago when the Graduate Council proposed that every five years the membership of every member of the Graduate Faculty should be reviewed, and if he had not done anything of a scholarly nature over those five years, he would be dropped from the Graduate Faculty. Well, this caused a great deal of furor and never was approved. But in the meantime, some criteria were set up so that it is fairly difficult for a

new faculty member to become a member of the Graduate Faculty until he's demonstrated some kind of scholarly ability. When it first started, everybody just automatically was put in, but it now requires a terminal degree and a certain amount of publication, and usually, I think at least one semester of teaching at the graduate level—something like that; I've forgotten how it works out. And then there are restrictions which require that the members of a graduate committee be members of the Graduate Faculty and so on. And so all those regulations have developed and have increased, I think, the stature of the graduate program, generally.

The other thing that has happened, of course, is that requirements for graduate study have been developed in different departments and different colleges, and some University-wide ones have developed. These also have been controversial. Entrance requirements are perhaps the ones that have caused the most controversy.

And originally, when Dean O'Brien—and the year I was dean of the Graduate School, these mostly involved fights between the graduate office and the College of Education, particularly some departments in the College of Education. The—oh, I don't know what it's called now— [Thomas] Tucker's department. But it is essentially a graduate department, and every teacher in the state, every administrator in the state, was aspiring to get at least a master's degree and was wanting to do this without doing any work—and was being successful a good deal of the time! So a lot of the Graduate Council's rules were put in, unfortunately for the wrong reason, as ways of disciplining the College of Education or that particular department at getting them there. And then there were constant battles back and forth. O'Brien and Tucker had a battle almost every third day, and I inherited

O'Brien's role there, although I didn't have as much trouble, I guess, as O'Brien had had, just because I didn't have as long to work with it. But there was this constant battle of Tucker trying to slip somebody through who was not qualified, and O'Brien putting down his foot, and that went on for a long time.

And there's still, of course, some of that same controversy: the Education college, which has a great bulk of the graduate work, arguing that these are people who are important in the state, and the fact that they had 0 averages as undergraduates should have nothing to do with the fact that they now want to get degrees.

And so as a result of that, there were some other routes for admission put in. For example, you can get admitted on the basis of the Graduate Record Examination, or you can get admitted on the basis of a trial semester. But the trial semester got set up with a requirement that was fought by the College of Education, a requirement that if one takes a trial semester to try to establish his role, he must sign up for at least one course outside the college where he plans to get his degree. Well, this upset the College of Education considerably because they could bring in one of these illiterates and fix him up with a couple of easy courses in education, but if he took a course outside, he was likely to have trouble, and that caused some argument. But that regulation, I think, is still there. And also the regulation— well, most of them who had these bad records could also not qualify on the basis of the Graduate Record Examination, so that it was there.

Well, all of this was an attempt to maintain standards on a University-wide basis. There are still great differences in what's required to get a graduate degree in the University of Nevada, and I think there's need to do something to standardize requirements a little bit more.

For example, well, my wife is about finished with her master's degree in political science, and she's had already— is it two or three?—two, I guess, and has a third coming, full days of written examinations over books and materials in three different fields in political science, which means about twenty-four hours of writings, plus the orals later. That seems to me probably not necessarily excessive, but it's a good deal more than the average for a master's exam.

And in other departments and other colleges, the master's exam requires only an oral examination. And I have sat in on some of those orals, in which the student is not asked a single question, and if anybody outside the department happens to ask a question, the department members answer it for the student, so that [laughs] it's—.

Those are both exaggerated, but there is that difference. Probably, as I'm in favor of the fairly rigid requirements— but at least there ought to be something nearer, a similarity, mostly because students rightly resent— well, it lowers the dignity or the quality of the degree if you can get it without doing anything, and the students who have to work very hard obviously resent seeing the students who get them without very much work. And that's a very hard thing to regulate, but it needs to be done.

There have been attempts to regulate it, and one of them is establishing committees with University-wide representation—a representative from the Graduate Council frequently, or from the Graduate School—so that for the final examinations the University supposedly can maintain standards by having this University-wide committee sitting in on the exam and looking at the Ph.D. dissertations or looking at master's examinations. The difficulty I have discovered while I was in the graduate office with that

scheme is that very soon departments which wanted to get by without very much, learned who the easy touches were on the rest of the faculty, and would prompt the students to go around and try to get them to serve on their committees as the outside members, and they would do it. Well, one of the things that Dean O'Brien (and I followed it) had developed in the graduate office was a kind of checklist so that some of these perennial easy marks for the graduate committees were no longer appointed, and he would simply veto them. And of course, every time he did this or I did that, there was another battle. But luckily, we could use the excuse that he was too busy, that he had already too many appointments, and [laughing] so we could keep him from doing it.

But in general, I suppose, that we, in many departments, do a much more rigorous master's examination than a lot of much more prestigious universities. There's more time here for individual attention and so on, and a place—Berkeley, for example, the last I knew was doing graduate classes of a hundred or a hundred and twenty students. They were really just like undergraduate classes at a different level, so that—. Then the master's thesis has disappeared from most institutions; some departments still require it, although most now have an optional arrangement.

But the master's degree here, I think, is likely to be much more rigorous than it is in a lot of better places—in some departments. And I think the Ph.D. programs are probably just as good. Another advantage again is that the numbers of graduate students are fewer, so that the attention they get is better.

The library, of course, is not as good as the library at Berkeley or Yale, but it's adequate for most of the degrees that are given. And the things like the availability of microcards and microfiche and the improvement in

interlibrary loan schemes make it really not the handicap it was several years ago, so that the library now has most of the basic bibliographical tools available. And if you've got those, then almost everything else is within reach, so the library is not the handicap it used to be for graduate study.

And the students on the whole, I think, can do a very good Ph.D. It's sometimes hard to place the—. One of the things that's true—we were talking about availability of jobs—there's just no doubt that when there are too few jobs for the number of Ph.D.'s, that the Yale and Harvard Ph.D.s are going to have a better shot at the job than the Nevada Ph.D. I would do the same thing if I were [chuckling] hiring, even though it isn't necessarily true that the Yale or Harvard Ph.D. is any better. He may not be any better at all, but it's a better gamble probably. And so it does make it difficult for the Nevada Ph.D. to get placed.

Those we've turned out in the last few years, I really don't know much about. There haven't been any large numbers. I just don't remember now. Bill Abrams is working in the state Department of Education, and he did a very good degree in American poetry [chuckles], but he's doing a good job with the state department now, and that helps. I can't think of other people who got degrees recently—no, I don't. It's hard to know what the future of the graduate program will be. It may be that—you know, if we're really faced with some drastic budget cutting, graduate education is expensive—and it may be that some of that will go, although I think it would be a pity if it does because it does detract from the development of the total university. It just shifts and changes the atmosphere of the whole place if the graduate work disappears. And so I hope that things don't get desperate enough to do that. And there really needs to be in the state one graduate institution at least.

Part of the problem, of course, is that Las Vegas would like to have two graduate institutions or the one in Las Vegas [chuckles], and that's always going to be a kind of problem. But I think it is likely to continue and grow a little. One thing that does make a difference, I was noticing in the paper this morning enrollment projections for California colleges are that they'll drop by twenty percent in the next ten years just because of birth-rate drops. But I think probably the guesses are still that Nevada will maintain its enrollments pretty much in spite of the birthrate drop, that the population increases tend to keep it up. And that may mean, of course, that if the budget austerity continues, it gets more difficult to teach the [laughing] additional students, but it might work otherwise.

The Graduate School really did start developing after Dean [Thomas] O'Brien came. He was a chemist; he'd been—I'm not sure where he came from now—Middlewest someplace. But he did come almost—well, soon after he came, the boom in federal funding started, and I think I did mention that there was money available for some fellowships and for support of some graduate study, and as a result the graduate programs developed particularly in some of the sciences, but also in the humanities departments. And this continued after Dean [John] Nellor came.

Dean Nellor had a background at Michigan State in research development, and that was a major interest. And when Dean Nellor came, one of the sorts of changes was that the position was officially made Dean of the Graduate School and Director of Research. Under Dean O'Brien, what research activity he had sponsored, he'd done just as a natural outgrowth of this position as dean, but he hadn't been specifically hired for the purpose of developing the research program. In a way

that difference existed because the Desert Research Institute had been on the campus for a while, and there'd just been no change when the Desert Research Institute moved off. But when Dean Nellor came, there had been—oh, there was a committee; I guess it was the selection committee (I forget)—but we met fairly regularly and met particularly in the early stages to talk about what the job ought to involve, that is, what kinds of job description there should be for the dean of the Graduate School. And it turned out that it was recommended he be dean of the Graduate School and Director of Research.

Unfortunately, Dean Nellor came also at about the time the federal support tended to slack off, so that he did have to work on developing other sources for research support. And the state of Nevada has never been totally devoted to the idea of research, and so that was a fairly difficult problem. Both Dean O'Brien and Dean Nellor were, I think, respected in the faculty and had positions of general leadership. O'Brien, particularly, tended to have a good deal of faculty support and get put on committees when the faculty wanted someone they could trust and that kind of thing; he was widely respected. He's down in San Diego now—retired three years ago, I guess, now. And he comes back once in a long time—not very frequently, but he does once in a while.

The graduate program is always a problem in a school the size of Nevada. And this is a sort of summary of the major problem, and the major problem is that in a state the size of Nevada it is difficult on a straight-cost basis to justify the high-cost graduate programs that exist. And at the same time it's almost impossible these days to have a high-quality institution if there is not graduate study. So that the state faces a real decision on whether to allocate the graduate work to the Reno

campus and economize in that way on it, or whether to yield to the political pressure which will grow and grow to have graduate work at both institutions. And if it does yield to that political pressure, the high quality of graduate work at both institutions will be much more slowly developed because, well, we don't have a top-notch research library at Nevada, Reno, now, and Vegas is a long, long way from one. Even if you've got the money, even if you're Texas, you can't build a great library overnight, and it takes time [chuckles]. And many of the libraries in the eastern universities, which have not been able to provide the kind of heavy cash flow that some of the others have, still are better libraries just because of the long tradition and the long background they've had.

Well, looking a little bit at Extension—and I was reminded the other day by Grace Donehower that I did, when I first went out to Extension, just routinely call the staff together for a kind of general staff meeting and discovered that it was the first such meeting they'd had for three or four years! [Laughs] And they just never got together. But what Grace Donehower was reminding me of was that I was both ignorant of Extension and not much interested in it, which was a kind of candid statement and which I guess they accepted as a candid statement. I followed it by saying that I was willing to learn, that I hoped they'd teach me something about it. But I was doing the Extension deanship along with the deanship of the Graduate School, so I was sort of doing the two jobs at once. And it worked all right, except a lot of running back and forth (the Extension offices were out at Stead).

And a kind of major problem at the time—one reason for doing it was that the Graduate School was sort of involved with the Extension, but also there was at the time the

problem of whether the Extension program should remain under the system as a statewide program or whether it should be part of the UNR system. And we spent a good deal of time during those days discussing whether it should be administratively part of the whole system and operate through the whole state or whether it should be UNR's.

It turned out that Las Vegas wanted an extension program, and so a lot of what went on in those days was trying to develop more or less formally, although not really in writing, a kind of Mason-Dixon line which ran through the middle of Tonopah. And there was a kind of agreement that we would not do extension south of Tonopah, and Vegas wouldn't come north of Tonopah—not really a terribly sensible arrangement.

And it, I think, is symptomatic of what was the problem with Extension then, and is still a problem with Extension, and is maybe inevitable so long as the Extension has to be self-supporting. That is, if you have an educational project which has to support itself, there's just no way to avoid the fact that the people running it want to survive and therefore, try to do what they can to make it as profitable an activity as they can. And this varies a good deal. The summer session is partly the same kind of thing.

One fight that is still going on, and in which I managed to be fairly adamant while I was vice president and to get away with it (I don't know how long it could happen now!) was an absolute veto on a notion that is perennially proposed by both the Extension and the summer session: the notion that you are paid, that the teachers are paid, on the basis of the enrollment. That is, if you have fifty students, you get paid twice as much as if you had twenty-five. And this makes a certain amount of economic sense in that the courses with the large enrollment do grow, and part

of the theory is that the instructor is given some incentive to try to encourage students to take his course. But the instructor also has some incentive to give everybody A's so that they will like taking his course, and not to assign any papers so that none of the students are discouraged from continuing. And up to now, as I say, I was successful— with a lot of support from other people—in opposing that notion. But it is one example of how the need for the program to be self-supporting tends to work against academic standards and academic excellency. And there's probably no way to avoid it if it's going to be a course of that sort.

Another thing, of course, is that the administrator is tempted to utilize any sort of slave labor he can, and so he may very well find that he can get instructors who happen to want to teach or get a foot in the door or something; he can get them at totally inadequate salaries. And sometimes they're very, very good, of course, but sometimes they are not. And it does tend to make a lot of decisions depend on the wrong kinds of bases; instead of considering the academic requirements and the needs of the students and so on, one has to consider the practical feasibility of being able to finance the course and make it come out.

Well, that was a long, roundabout digression, but it's related to the fact that the Extension program, while I was there and since that time, has had problems particularly because of the need for being self-supporting. That, of course, runs the Extension program into various sorts of difficulties with the academic departments, and that's another difficulty.

Not only the need for being self-supporting, but also the very practical needs of the state in having it are part of what causes the opposition with the academic

departments. That is, the Extension people recognize that there are people in Fallon and Ely and Pioche and so on, who want to go to school and who just practically can't get to the Reno campus, and that there's a very real, legitimate demand there for some kind of course work. But they also realize that to pay a full-time instructor in Pioche is just not feasible. So you've got two alternatives: you find someone who is nearby, who is qualified to teach, and you put him temporarily on the staff to do some of the work; or you ship somebody by airplane out of Reno once or twice or three times a week, whatever it takes. And that's been a longtime way of running the instruction of Extension.

When I was at Indiana, I took a bus once or twice a week—I guess just once a week—from Bloomington to Indianapolis and taught four hours from seven till eleven, and then took the bus sixty miles back, and did it, of course, for a salary that was about a third of my other salary, which is another part of the whole Extension—.

Well, it isn't in opposition, but there's constantly a kind of conflict course between regular faculty and the Extension program, and it's partly that the faculty people feel exploited by doing this teaching as an overload at relatively small salaries. And the Extension people say, "You're not forced to do this." And no one is forced to do it, and the pressures, of course, are against their doing it because it isn't good for the faculty member's development.

Well, these are among the various dilemmas that occur in connection with Extension programs, and there are all sorts of complications. The Extension people get a request from Elko to run a course in history, let's say. The people in Elko are very eager; they want the course, and there are maybe fifteen of them already, and the tuition would

be enough to pay a kind of salary. So they go to the history department: "Who wants to go out to Elko and teach the course?" And nobody wants to.

So they go out there and discover there's a high school teacher who has a master's degree and is pretty well thought of, and they propose that he teach. But the history department says, "No, we won't recognize the credits; he doesn't have a Ph.D., and he's not qualified."

And you get that kind of conflict: the Extension people want to do the course, but the history people will not cooperate, and they're both right in a way. And then you get other kinds of alternatives. The history department says, "Okay, we'll send a young instructor out."

The young instructor goes out, and three years later he comes up for promotion and has done no research, and he says, "But I was urged by the history department to go out in Elko and teach twice a week, and that took up all my research time, and I didn't have time to do it."

And the promotion committee is likely to say, "Too bad." And so that becomes another complication.

The whole question of how do you run an Extension program, in other words, seems to me really very difficult to solve. Last year, long after I was out of the deanship, we did develop (and I had good cooperation from [Richard T.] Dankworth and the Extension people in doing it) what I hope will turn out to be a better kind of scheme, in which the colleges, the academic colleges, take much more responsibility for the Extension programs, and in which the pressures to become entrepreneurs are less on the Extension Division—partly because the rewards won't go there.

One of the things that has happened is that a good, vigorous dean and director of Extension programs can build up enough

surplus that there are travel monies and all sorts of good things in the Extension Division that the rest of the University doesn't have, which is another reason for some of the resentment that has occurred. The funds that come in are not restricted in the way state funds are, so that anyone who wants to go to a meeting from Extension is likely to have his travel and his per diem paid, and almost nobody else in the faculty enjoys that kind of support. There are some places where there's a lot of money, too, but most of the time they don't. And so there's resentment that develops there.

But I think this new scheme in which the colleges do take the responsibility for getting it done and do manage the academic parts of it, and the Extension department is mainly a kind of facilitator—if this works and if the colleges will take it seriously, I think it will be a better scheme. And in general, the notion is that the colleges will work toward making the Extension teaching part of the regular load of any faculty member who does it, so that it's not done as an overload. And the income may be used to hire a substitute, a temporary substitute, to fill in for the person on the campus, so that regular staff member can go out. With some exceptions, obviously, the notion will be to try to get away from the overload thing.

I think one reason it may not work as well as I hope it will is that the faculty members, even though they gripe constantly about how little they are paid for these overload courses, and even though they insist that they do this only out of loyalty to their college and so on, I strongly suspect that the pressure even at the inadequate pay, that the pressure for getting that pay will continue. A lot of people will want to do it as overloads, even at three hundred dollars a credit, or whatever it is now—which may be only a third of the regular salary of a lot of the people doing it.

On the Community College System and the restructuring of GUE, I'm not sure why those are in the same topic. Did you feel the relationship—?

Well, I did feel, from reading Hulse's history, that he seemed to think that as the Community College System developed, they then took some of the functions away from the GUE. I was wondering about that relationship.

Yes, well, in that sense I'm sure it's true that in a couple of ways this occurred. One of them—the community colleges very quickly developed their own extension programs. And they're still doing this, and they are doing more and more at the lower-division levels, so that the University Extension faces a new kind of problem. It's the freshman courses that tend—in Extension just as in the University generally—that tend to be the meal tickets. And so with most of the lower-division courses disappearing, the upper-division courses are really in trouble from time to time. And in the last two sessions of the legislature, I think Extension has received a special fund for subsidizing courses, particularly in outlying areas and particularly upper-division courses that just won't go, otherwise. And that's been a very good thing; whether it'll come out of this session is dubious. But it was a good idea, and it did help.

And it raises further problems for Extension academically because the more advanced a course gets, I suppose, the more difficult it is to do it through Extension. The Graduate School, for example, insists with some justice that you should not do graduate courses in Pioche if there's no library there, that graduate study almost by definition requires library research. And if you don't have a library facility, then you can't do it. So there's been a constant conflict between the

Graduate School and the Extension programs, with the Extension programs wanting to give graduate credit, particularly in education, where the teachers in the state want it in order to increase their salaries; they don't, I think, care tremendously about whether it's really graduate work or not, but they want it to be called graduate work. And at the same time the Graduate School is pointing out that these are not really graduate study, and—.

Again one solution or possible solution that I proposed, I guess, when I was dean of the Graduate School first (and I never could get anywhere with it and still don't), what I had proposed was that there be two kinds of graduate credit, if you like, or two definitions of graduate credit. And in a sense we've come to that, I guess. But that is, one kind of graduate credit be given simply to someone who has a baccalaureate degree and who takes any course beyond the baccalaureate, and this is graduate credit only just in the sense that the person doing it is a graduate when he takes it. And none of that credit counts toward a degree of any kind; it's just additional credit that we'd call it. This is just elaborate double-talk, of course, but it seemed a way of meeting the double-talk requirements of state accreditation and for teachers and so on. And then the other kind of graduate credit would be a graduate credit leading toward a master's or a doctoral degree in some way or other, and this would be what the Graduate School would consider real graduate credit, in which there were prerequisites and in which the student was required to demonstrate more than baccalaureate achievement.

And for some reason or other this has always seemed too complicated to the Graduate Council or—well, the other objection which may be more substantial—the other objection is that this kind of thing would water down graduate study. And

I guess my contention is that it would do just the opposite because it would free real graduate study to be real graduate study. But that's never caught on. [Laughs]

It seems to make sense to me.

I think it does, and I think that it's an almost inevitable solution. And we had some approaches to that with the numbering system when—oh, I forget how the numbers work now—it used to be that a six-hundred-level course was a graduate course, was a junior undergraduate course that had graduate equivalent. The numbers have changed, but it's true that six-hundred courses did not apply toward a master's degree, and in a way that was a move in that direction.

But it is hard to deal with the Extension aspects of graduate study, especially, because the teachers out in the state want to have it recognized as graduate work. They feel that since they are "graduates," anything they take is "graduate work." And that maybe is a play on words, that's worth capitalizing on; just recognize that graduate can be used in two ways, and let it be used in two ways [laughing]!

But again, I'm getting far from the subject. The Community College System did affect the Extension, you know, in those ways, in that it took over some of the functions of the lower-division courses, particularly. Because the community colleges were established in more communities in the state, some of the need for Extension work disappeared. Elko, for example, used to be one of the major centers of University Extension work. In fact, the community colleges there developed during the year I was dean of the Extension Division, pretty much. And I think if we had done a little better job and if our PR with some legislators had been a little better, there really wasn't much need for a community college in Elko.

There was a lot of discussion during the time, and the person who was doing the Extension program out of Reno was not really competent, I think, and I can simply blame him rather than taking the blame myself. But it was a combination of things. But for some reason or other, there kept being just one mix-up after another on every course we started in Elko.

And at the same time, there was this vigorous citizens' group pushing for a community college in Elko. And Governor Laxalt at the time was supporting it and had wangled some money from Howard Hughes—not very much, but a little bit to be used to get the program started. As I remember, that was about \$40,000, and I think the Elko people spent it—it might have been fairly wisely under different circumstances—they spent it for a dean and an assistant dean to get the college off the ground. And it turned out that the dean and his assistant dean, who happened to be his wife, managed to get the \$40,000 and do practically nothing about starting [laughing] a community college in Elko, so the thing was delayed a little while. But it did get started, and the whole Extension program in Elko didn't—it was unnecessary, except that there still is the demand for upper-division and graduate credits, with difficulty supporting it.

I never knew much about the Nevada Technical Institute. I don't even know why it started now. I don't know when it went out of existence, but I don't remember—I think it was related to Extension, but I don't remember having much to do with it when I was dean of Extension.

It was very, very short-lived.

It was related again to the community colleges, of course, because the Nevada

Technical Institute had started and hadn't lasted very long, but it started as an administrative way of handling a number of terminal-degree, two-year programs that existed on the campus. And when the community colleges were established, the Nevada Technical Institute simply split up its functions between the community colleges and the University. The University retained the two-year ag program and the engineering technology program, and I think maybe that's all that came out of there. I don't know whether med tech was in the technical institute or not. I don't think it was; I think it was always on the campus in the Medical School (I'm not sure of that).

But anyway, it did disappear, then, and Harry Wolf, who had been director of the technical institute, came back on the campus as something or other (I've forgotten what job he had when he first came back to the campus). He's now Affirmative Action officer.

Tell me about Grace Donehower. She's practically been Extension, hasn't she?

Yeah, Grace, who is—I haven't talked to Grace for quite a little while. She was very bitter the last I talked to her. And I thought she was starting some kind of action charging sexual discrimination in her not being considered for the directorship of the Extension this time or something. I don't know; I wasn't really involved in much of that, and I think any formal action occurred after I was out of the office. But I think maybe with some reason Grace feels bitter about the whole thing, although it's also true, I think, that there were a lot of circumstances that prevented her from moving into the administrative jobs, plus the fact that I think her opponents for the positions usually were better qualified, or at least you could

demonstrate that they were. So I don't think there really was any discrimination against Grace.

On the other hand, she had her reasons always to feel that she should be given more administrative preference. She started out—well, she was an English teacher (I think she has a master's degree maybe in English); she taught English some. And then she was a Girl Scout leader for a long time—the official—I mean the whatever the administrative hierarchy of Girl Scouts is, but she held a position like that for a long time.

She came to the University to run the Correspondence Division, and I think really she's never had any permanent or long-range job except running the Correspondence program. And she was very good there, I think. She's a meticulous kind of administrator, handles all the details, and keeps everything very orderly and very proper. She became active in the national association of—whatever they are—correspondence and extension people; she became active there. She was president of it just a few years ago. She at various times was the only person with the kind of common sense and stability that you could rely on. And I relied on Grace a great deal when I was dean of the Extension, because she had good sense, and she wasn't going to lose her temper or do something stupid. And almost everybody else out there, it seemed to me, was difficult to deal with one way or another. so I got along well with Grace and had a lot of respect for her ability.

She was acting director or acting dean at various times for relatively short periods, which I think she's resentful about in that she was good enough to take over for a short time but never good enough for the permanent job. But she did well, I think, whenever she was acting. And at the same time, I think probably in every instance in which she was

not given an administrative post, overlooking her could be justified (whether rightly or not, I don't know). So I think it's too bad that she is being sort of, I suspect, pushed out and that she is bitter about it, because within certain limitations I think she's very good and always was devoted and hardworking and this kind of thing. She must be fairly near retirement now; I don't know.

She may be talking about retiring early a little. I don't know. She has had some ill health lately, too, which complicates things for her. And she used to teach Extension from time to time and I guess teach freshman English courses off and on. But I haven't talked to her—oh gosh, I bet it's almost two years now, one way or another, so I haven't seen much of her.

I hear her name so often in relation to Correspondence and Extension.

Well, she's really had much the longest connection with it intimately of anybody around and knows certainly a lot about it, I think, about the whole procedure. She keeps up on the current articles about what one should be doing in Extension and this kind of thing. Not all them do that, but quite a lot do. Well, do you think of anything else about Extension?

I was wondering what you think about that new UNITE system that the telephone, television—. That intrigues me.

I don't know a lot about how it's working. I think it's a fascinating kind of idea. The "UNITE" came in because telecommunication, which they were first using, turned out to be a copyrighted name for something that they're not doing, so they shifted it to the UNITE, and I can't remember what it means now either; it's an acronym, I think.

Well, you know, you always have questions about this kind of thing in terms of academic standards, and that was the kind of question the faculty first raised. The Extension people quite wisely talked very good people into doing the program at the start of it, so that the persons doing the lectures could not be criticized by the rest of the faculty for incompetence because most of them were recognized as being competent by the faculty, and that disarmed the faculty criticism pretty quickly.

And I just haven't talked to any—Jim Hulse did a course, I think, and Jim Richardson—and I haven't talked to 'em about how it actually worked. They were fairly enthusiastic when it first started. But the thing I haven't checked on is whether it turned out to be just a telephone or radio lecture, or whether this feedback, question-and-answer sort of thing actually did develop, because that seemed to me the most intriguing aspect of it. If it weren't for that, then just a radio or a Sunrise Semester kind of thing would have worked as well. But this had the advantage of presumably allowing the student to tap back and talk to the instructor and to get questions answered and this kind of thing. And I just have no idea how that was going to work, and I—well, I just don't know. But that seemed to me a very interesting idea, and one that improved greatly on these mass media, long-distance courses, because the whole business of the television program and the radio program and the rest I think is up in the air; I don't think people know how well it's working. It hasn't had the great boon that was anticipated at the earlier stages of it. And it's hard to know in some ways whether it works better than correspondence, even.

And there have been developments there. Eight or ten years ago Xerox got all excited about a new kind of extension program

utilizing television and the correspondence concept at the same time. I got paid very well—three or four of us were on a committee. Walker Gibson in Massachusetts, and Jix Jones in Iowa, and I, I guess were the committee, and we sat together for about four weekends in a Chicago hotel and made notes, and then wrote out some programs, and got paid very handsomely by Xerox. But they gave up soon after that, so I think they were never used.

But that whole business is uncertain. For example, I think it's still not clear whether television instruction in, say, freshman English saves money or not. It does, of course, if it's exclusively television instruction. But if it's done and kept fairly live, and if the production costs are considered in it—not only the faculty time, but the considerable production time, and then whatever monitoring has to be done when the courses are viewed—it seems a question whether it can be done more cheaply that way or with live instructors, particularly when Ph.D.s in English are a dime a dozen, and you can [laughing] get it done cheaply that way.

But all of these things are intriguing and useful. On the campus, for example, the mathematics department is using a television program for one of its freshman courses, and it's been doing it, oh, ten, twelve years now very successfully, apparently. Students like it, and it saves them some staff, and it seems to be producing just as much ability or skill in whatever—I don't know whether it's freshman algebra or what it is, but it seems to be working. And Don Pfaff has been pretty much fathering the thing, and it's been going very well, I think. How much that kind of thing would work out in the state, I just don't know. Even the television short courses get all confused.

I remember one several years ago that was very popular; a young linguist from Oregon

had made the course, and he was a highly-respected linguist and did very well. I showed it to a summer session class—mostly women teachers, I think, in the class—and all they could worry about was the fact that young O'Neil kept brushing his hair back when it got in his eyes, and that he also looked like he had a haircut like a hippie, and as far as I could tell, they never heard a word he said; they spent all their time [laughing] worrying about those irrelevancies!

But it's true that we're enough attuned to a kind of technical perfection in looking at television, that if the production isn't very good and if the acting is not up to par, it's distracting. And the bad actors or inadequate actors don't make good television professors, apparently. And on the other hand, one of the first of the successful television programs was a man named Frank Baxter at USC, who—what was his program called? It was quite popular; it was syndicated and all over. And it was a program on literature, and it was really very good, although Baxter himself had no respect from his faculty at USC at all; he was not a recognized scholar, but he was a perfectly competent scholar and literary scholar, but he was a very good actor [chuckles] and a very good television speaker, and he made the program work quite well. I can't think of what it was called.. But it was one of the very early academic programs. It ultimately got out of straight educational stations and got onto the network programs. (I can't remember—.) And it was there.

Well, let's see, is there anything else we ought to think about on Extension? It's true probably that the Extension programs are going to become increasingly important. I think there's no doubt that with the shift in the age level of students and with the increase in returning adults both to work on degrees and just for general education, that the future of

Extension or something that serves the same purpose is pretty important in the growth of a university. And I guess if I were predicting, I'd say that that shift is likely to be maybe the most notable academic shift within the next ten or dozen years, that is, the shift of emphasis onto in-service training, adult education; I think "continuing education" is what you call it in the jargon of the Extension divisions. And I think that's going to become increasingly important, and take an increasing amount of the University's resources to keep it going.

And it requires a different attitude on the part of faculty and teachers. It's quite different to teach evening courses to adults from teaching freshmen—seventeen-, eighteen-year-olds, who come in. And frequently, teachers do run into trouble with the evening courses and the Extension course, just because they don't recognize the different kind of audience. And the last thing you dare do is be patronizing or be condescending in any way to an adult audience. My theory is you don't do it in a freshman class either, but then [chuckling] you can get away with it there, I suppose. Well, what do you think? Have we polished off Extension?

Looking at the next outline section, then, on the Arts and Science deanship—[chuckling] the selection process—I don't remember much about the selection process at the time. There was a committee; I was appointed acting dean just on the spur of the moment. In fact, I wasn't in Reno at the time; I was at a meeting in Denver.

I don't know whether we described the circumstances of it. [Harold] Kirkpatrick, who was the dean, had—well, it was a strange episode that I still don't quite understand. Kirk, who was a good friend and I think a good person and a good dean, went off to a meeting in—was it Albuquerque? someplace in the Southwest—a meeting of a historical

association. He got there, and he was tired, and apparently he said to himself what seems to me perfectly understandable to say, "Oh, I don't want to go to another meeting; I've been doing meetings all week." And he got off the airplane and turned around and got back on the airplane and went down to Monterey or someplace in Mexico (I think it was Monterey) and spent the weekend on a holiday, came back, and apparently got back and panicked and thought he had done something that he shouldn't have done, that he had to cover it, and so he described his functions at the meeting to the president and turned in his travel report and accepted the travel money for the trip.

Well, it turned out that some kind of crisis had come up while he was gone, and the president had had to telephone him at the meeting in Albuquerque or wherever it was, and he was not there and was not registered. And so he confessed that—. It was all a strange and hard-to-understand fiasco. And the president was pretty sympathetic, except Kirk did for reasons I've never understood lie about it. You know, all he had to do was say, "I got to the meeting and I decided I didn't want to go and I went off on a holiday. Here's the money back." But he didn't. And [laughing] the president, who was a good friend and was sympathetic, was in a real bind.

There were various people on the campus who did not like Kirk particularly, and found out about it, were after him in a minute, and went to the Board of Regents, of course, where there were some who didn't like Kirk either. And so the pressure was on the president to fire him immediately. And there wasn't anything Miller could do about keeping him in the deanship; he simply had to get him out of the deanship immediately. And so he was removed from the deanship but allowed to stay on in history. And that pacified the

wolves who were after him to some extent. And that was, I think, a relatively mild kind of punishment, an understanding sort of punishment. And I don't know yet what—I talked to Kirk about it, and I never did understand why or what he did, or why he did it, and nobody else seemed to. There were a lot of people sympathetic, but at the same time there was no way to explain the procedure, and it just looked like falsifying—well, it was falsifying [chuckling] in a travel report request.

Well, anyway, Kirk had to leave the deanship like that, and I was at a meeting in Denver, and Edd Miller just appointed me—or called me first, of course—and then made the appointment so that there wasn't any search or anything else on the acting deanship. When the deanship was to be filled, though, there was a committee, and I don't remember much about it except I was interviewed by the committee, I guess. I don't know whether there were any other local candidates or not. I don't think there were at that time. And I don't think the committee did a lot of searching outside. I think the committee pretty much assumed that if I would accept the deanship, they didn't have to search very widely. And I was, then, appointed dean.

At the time, I was concerned about a couple of things. One of the conditions, I remember, that I made with the president was that there be a term on the deanship, that it not be an eternal appointment, and I had specified that I wanted a three-year term. The president, I think, said a five-year term, and so we compromised on a five-year term! But at least there was a term, and it was the first time any deanship had had a term on it, and then the by-laws of the college incorporated that term later, so that the dean does serve a five-year term. He may, if he agrees and if the college wishes, may be reappointed, but there

must be some kind of evaluation machinery before he's reappointed, which seems to me necessary in administrative jobs—that there needs to be some way for the administrator to get out gracefully and save face if that's what he wants, or for the college to get rid of him gracefully without a lot of furor, if that's what makes sense. And so that was incorporated into the by-laws.

At the same time, the new by-laws incorporated another provision, though, which seems to me utterly silly, and that is that anyone who accepts an appointment as an acting dean cannot be considered as a candidate for the deanship. And at the moment, Paul Page, who has been acting dean in Arts and Science, is ineligible to be a candidate for the deanship. And apparently he's done an excellent job as dean, and people now would be quite happy to [chuckling] consider him as a candidate for the permanent job, but they're caught in their by-laws. So he's not being considered. And I guess that some people still think an acting dean should not be considered, which makes no sense to me at all.

I suppose the reason for it is maybe to prevent the acting dean from managing things in such a way that he is concerned about his own succession, something of that sort. But it makes no sense to me whatsoever; I've never seen any reason for it. The same kind of thing was talked about when Joe Crowley was acting president. And it seems to me not to make any sense. But one of the reasons, I guess, is that "acting" has never occurred to me to make any sense. An administrator serves pretty much in his administrative position at the pleasure of the president anyway. That is, there's no kind of tenure in any administrative position, and in that sense he's always "acting." And I don't know what the opposite—if he's not an acting dean, I don't know what he is—an "unacting dean," or a "nonacting dean?" [Chuckles]

I did, I remember, insist when I was technically, I guess, acting dean of the Graduate School (in that it was understood that I was not going to be dean as soon as O'Brien came back), but I insisted on not having a title of acting dean; I was dean for the year. And I thought I was responsible for what I did and that I ought to be responsible for it. And the same with the Extension thing. So that the term "acting" has never made any sense to me, and I can't see why there should be any distinction.

Page should have been appointed dean for a one-year term. And it could be renewed, and because they didn't do the national search, they would have to do a national search at the end of that year. But I'm not even sure that that was necessary.

But the rule that the acting dean cannot succeed into a regular spot seems to me to make no sense. And I don't really know what the basis of it was; I wasn't having much to do with the committee that revised the Arts and Science by-laws in that way. I questioned it at the time when it came to the vice president's office, but it's fairly recent that they made that rule. So it's there! But it is a funny one.

I think it is causing problems now.

Oh yes, I think it is, because there is quite a lot of support for the idea that Page should be kept on as dean. And in a way it's very uneconomical to give a person a year in which he learns a job, and particularly if he seems to have learned it well, then to throw that training time away and bring somebody else in, because it takes—I think for anybody—it takes a certain amount of time to learn the routines of any administrative job. There are just a lot of things that you learn. There are some of them you never learn; I never learned to remember to do all the things properly

with personnel actions, but that was mostly memory rather than not knowing what to do. And so I think it doesn't make any sense.

I don't know that some of the other things on your outline are worth a lot of comment—. The organization of the dean's office isn't anything very significant, although I did make some changes when I was in the dean's office. The scheme that Kirkpatrick had started was to have two halftime associate deans, and this never seemed to me very practical. The people in the spot were either doing two fulltime jobs or were not able to do either of them adequately; it just was terribly hard for two people working half-time to do it. And they couldn't arrange their schedules very well so that one of them was around all the time. And they were constantly divided in their interests. And I think most of what really happened is that they devoted more than half-time in the dean's office and skimped on their teaching. But even so, it didn't work out as well. So I did make a change; when one of the associate deans resigned, I simply had a one full-time associate deanship. And I think that worked better, and I think that procedure has continued.

And I think I ran into difficulties on the appointment of the associate dean, which—well, the way these things almost always work (I think we've had difficulty ever since Affirmative Action started) whenever an incumbent has tended to be appointed. And I'd thought that with the appointment of the associate dean full-time, I had, and I guess that I did fulfill technically all the requirements of Affirmative Action. That is, I advertised it locally and did accept applications and did have a committee appointed to survey the applications and did actually follow the committee's recommendations. But it turned out that in practice the definition of the job was such that Ed Kleiner, who had been

one of the half-time associate deans, had an infinitely better shot at it than anybody else!—which was fine with me. If it hadn't been for all the necessary machinery, I'd just have appointed Kleiner without any kind of other considerations because he'd been doing a good job, and he knew the job, and [there] didn't seem to be any reason for a change. But anyway, various people, including the Affirmative Action Committee, were upset about that, thinking that it had been rigged so that Kleiner had a good shot at it. And in a way it was. Not technically, but in practice it was so arranged that he could qualify and almost nobody else could. Also the candidates who applied were not—in the eyes of the committee, at least—were not as well qualified as he was.

But except for that change, the staff is relatively small. It has a larger clerical staff than any other dean's office, just because the college is so much larger, and the record-keeping function and so on is a good deal more difficult in the dean's office than in other deans' offices. One of the things I've always wondered about is how much of all that record-keeping that goes on in the dean's office is really duplication of what goes on in the registrar's office—and what goes on in the department offices, too, sometimes with the majors—but it did seem almost necessary in order to keep the students directed toward graduation and to keep them aware of their advisors, that we have card files and pretty complete records on every student in the college. And that took a lot of work. And I think most of the colleges do do that, although with smaller numbers it isn't so big a task. But it does certainly duplicate a lot of what the registrar's office does, and I'm sure some of the departments do the same kind of thing, so it [chuckles] may take a lot of time.

But maybe it does help keep the students from getting quite so lost.

Oh, I'm sure it does. Well, it's a way of checking against their advisors and seeing if they do get advice and this kind of thing; it's hard to tell sometimes, but it does help, I think. And the departments don't have secretarial help enough to do it most of the time, so it's probably more efficient to do it in the dean's office, even though some departments duplicate.

But we have a file on each major and what he needs in order to complete his major requirements and the other requirements. And those get checked every semester. And if the student's not making the right kind of progress, he supposedly gets called in and does something about it, although it's amazing how many get missed, even with that process going! When they really work at it, students can manage to avoid getting any advice and get really fouled up, and some of them do. It takes a little doing.

I had, all the time I was in the dean's office, and I think the same has been true—a remarkably good staff. I inherited as sort of the senior secretary or administrative secretary in the department Dee—gosh, I've lost Dee's last name—[Kretzmeier]. Oh my gosh!

And I can't help you.

No, you wouldn't have known Dee. She retired three or four years ago—well, while I was still in the dean's office, Dee retired. Huh! Well, that's the silliest thing in the world! I can't think of her name suddenly. But Dee was extremely competent. She had arthritis fairly badly at the time I went down, and I suppose she missed an average of a full day every week. She always had all her sick leave

time and her other leave time used up, and I insisted that she stay home when she had to otherwise because I was happy to have her four days a week rather than anybody else five [laughs]!

But among other things, she worked out a kind of secretary's guide for all the people in Arts and Science, having samples of all the forms they needed and everything else; it was a supplement to the administrative manual and was very useful. And she mothered all the secretaries in the college and mothered them in a very sensible way. That is, she wasn't totally sympathetic always; she was very [laughing] firm in what she did. But they all loved Dee; she was a very, very good—. Her husband was Larry; he died also while she was still in the office. [Chuckles] But anyway, Dee was very, very good and very competent. And at the same time Joan Metcalfe was there, although she was not working full-time—well, almost full-time, but she left early in order to get home when her children got home from school. And Jackie Reed was there. And then the other position tended to be one that was filled irregularly. But those three had been there long enough that they knew what was going on. I had no problems in running the office at all. Everything just went very, very smoothly.

Then Dee retired, and then I got another stroke of luck. Mena Porta, who had been in the Arts and Science office long before that, and who had gone up [to] the vice president's office, was sort of unhappy when Jim Anderson did not continue in the vice president's office. And so I talked Mena into coming back to the Arts and Science office. And Mena was just as good as Dee. That is, Mena is practically faultless, as far as I can tell. She not only works hard, she never makes mistakes and knows all the answers to everything, and [is] very, very good.

And then when I left the Arts and Science office, Mena decided that she was getting sort of tired of having all the responsibility and that kind of thing; she also, I think (although she never would admit it), was a little worried about working for a woman and was a little bit apprehensive about working for Becky Stafford when Becky went down. But I partly reassured her, and she did stay on and work with Becky a year, and they became very buddy-buddy; they got along beautifully. But Mena still decided that she had too much stress and too much pressure in the job, and she went back to registrar's office, where she's still working and where she says there isn't much stress [chuckles]. Well, I think there isn't in the same way. It's not the kind of responsibility of answering questions for everybody else and taking care of things, and so she seems to like it there.

But after Mena left, Becky hired Alice Nevin into that job, and Alice has been very good. So the people who have worked in that office are just incredibly competent, I think, and not only competent, but so easy to get along with and just generally good people. Jackie Reed has been handling the student records and the major requirements and so on—well, for a long, long time, before Kirk went into the office. She's very good with students; she's sympathetic and they like her, but she doesn't make concessions. She just tells them the facts, and they take it from her. And she's very considerate and very helpful and also knows what she's doing, is hardworking, and so she's there.

Joan Metcalfe, who is the other person sort of permanently in the office, got a chance to get upgraded by becoming secretary in the mathematics department, and so she left the Arts and Science office to get a—I'm never sure about these clerical rankings, but she got something and could get it only in that

way. And then when I went up to the vice president's office, I talked Joan into coming up there, and she was my secretary there all the time I was there.

And so the staff was a remarkably good staff and still is, I think, without much question. I don't know the new secretaries who've come in, except Alice I know; well, and Sunny Minedew, who was in—where was she in the?—she may have been in sociology working for Becky, I'm not sure, but I knew her. She had been a secretary somewhere in the college before she moved over to the dean's office.

It seems that they would have to provide some sort of stability with the deans changing and having a new dean to break in, so to speak, and that would be a pretty tough job.

Well, they do, and Arts and Science has been lucky in that regard more—. Some of the other colleges—well, Business, for example, has had a frequent turnover in the secretarial staff. And with new deans coming in, it's been very hard to keep things going in some ways. And so Arts and Science has been lucky in that regard, and that's been good.

Your item on a typical day in the dean's office is interesting. I wouldn't even have the faintest notion about a typical dean's office day—! [Laughing]

Oh, the kinds of things that go on are: you try to get in early in the morning before the phone starts. And I've never been very good at getting in early in the morning, but I guess I got coming in earlier and earlier. And what you hope to do almost every morning is to get time to think about some things and maybe write some notes and reports and ultimata or whatever needs to be written, and you almost never do because the phone starts ringing, and there are questions and there are requests.

And if you allow it, I think the typical day is spent on the telephone in the dean's office most of the time, so that what you have to do is break it up by either saying you're not taking calls for a while or going to meetings and talking to people, and those are the other things that take a great deal of the time. There are some jobs that you simply have to make time for, like budgets and personnel decisions and things like that. And so some of the time you just have to allocate.

And the thing I think that's hardest about all university administration is forcing yourself to find time, really, to think about things instead of just acting all the time [chuckles]. I think it's characteristic of all administrative jobs in a university that they should be—and I think universities are—probably different somewhat from business in this regard (oh, maybe not, I don't know)—but I think the university administrator tends to be conscientious enough about doing the daily routine things, that he really never does have time to become an administrator in the real sense, to think about what the future of education ought to be, or to decide where the college ought to be going, or to develop plans for some kind of change or reform. I think too little of this occurs. And I think it's true in the president's office as well as in a department chairman's office, that not enough of the administrator's talents or abilities are utilized, that he spends a great deal of his time doing what a good clerk or a good secretary or at least a good assistant can do.

But one reason for that, of course, is that we are, in a university, so worried about over-administering that we are reluctant to supply adequate support, assistance, in any administrative office. And I guess I don't object to that; I think maybe administrative positions should not be pampered too much, or they tend to increase and tend

to be too many of them. And also I think probably universities need less administration sometimes than we think they do, in that professors ought to be competent to handle a lot of stuff without much administration. The fact that they're not may be just the result of the training we've developed in putting in more administration.

I think I mentioned that the year I taught at the University of Helsinki in Finland, so far as I could tell, the total administration consisted of a rector and the assistant rector, and the registrar and the assistant registrar. And the registrar had a bottle of ink and a dip pen and wrote down a name whenever anybody passed an examination, and also had a mimeograph machine where I could go occasionally and get something mimeographed. But so far as I could tell, that was the total university administration. And everything seemed to work out all right. And [laughing] it's true that the professor of literature and the professor of language did do certain kinds of things that were administrative, but they had no administrative titles and no administrative machinery. There were, as far as I could tell, no faculty meetings or anything of that sort—once in a while something social. But things seemed to develop all right—I don't know!

So I'm not sure how much we've over-accustomed the faculty to having administration, or students to being administered. It's a different kind of system; I think that the Helsinki system would not work at the University of Nevada very well. Well, one major difference is that everything depended on passing examinations and—you know, they didn't have to take any courses if they didn't want to. Pass the examinations, you get a degree. And so the procedure for Well, I think I mentioned that the scheduling was done—along early in October you fill out a little three-by-five card saying, "I will lecture

at such-and-such an hour in such-and-such a place on the following subject," and stick it on the bulletin board. And then you go around; if anybody shows up, you talk to 'em! And [laughing] that seemed to be the system. And that was all there was to it, I guess. and it seemed to work all right. [Chuckles]

Oh, one thing that I see that would be against that here is an awful lot of concern that a student—someone—might come in and absorb that lecture without paying for it, if we don't have all these ways of keeping—.

Yes, that's one of the problems. And I don't know how Helsinki managed its tees and things, because there didn't seem to be any registration system that amounted to anything. The students did have little books that they carried around with them, and they would come up after the first lecture or something and get you to sign their book, indicating that they were planning to take these lectures or something. But some of them would sign up—I noticed some books—they'd sign up for as many as ten or fifteen of those. Well, they obviously didn't plan to take them all, and it didn't seem—it didn't give 'em any grade or anything at the end; I don't know what those little books were for. They may have had to buy the books, something like that, or pay some kind of fee to get the books. And they may have had to have something in their books before they could sit for the examinations. But it didn't seem a very elaborately-worked-out system.

But it is true; we've got that kind of problem here. And well, I guess I've never been so very strict; if somebody wanted to sit in on a class, I never worried much about it, although technically, anyone who sits in is supposed to pay a fee as an auditor or something of that sort. And that, if it's really

administered literally, I think it gets a little silly.

But another reason, of course, is that our whole system depends so much on amassing certain numbers of credits and grades and the like, and in that system, the grades were important, but it was the grade on the examination that made the difference. And it was not necessarily a good system, I might say; the cramming for examinations, I think, is not the best way to learn always, and that's what was going on a lot of the time.

What sorts of things did you delegate, then, to your associate dean?

Oh yes, that I should have mentioned earlier; and that was one of the kinds of things that I think I was—when I mentioned I thought business, maybe, was different—I think in business more gets delegated maybe, and more should get delegated in the university. I did delegate a number of things, and we tried different delegation systems. I think what Kleiner and I finally worked out that worked best was that he handled all student complaints, except that when they insisted at the end after he said no, then he'd make—they came to see me [chuckles]. But usually, he took care of the student complaints, unless he wasn't there, and then I did. He handled all the graduate assistant problems and all the hiring of graduate assistants and all that, which was a fairly big job, and I think he's continuing to do that. And that took a great deal of time—that we settled on.

He sat in on some of the committees; that is, the dean is ex officio on all committees, and with the two of us splitting it, we could get to quite a number of the committee meetings. In particular, he took care of the curriculum and course change business. Jackie Reed did a lot of the detail, but he went to the meetings

and helped them with that. So that made a lot of difference.

And we tried to talk at least every morning for a while, so he'd know what was going on, and if I wasn't there, he could handle things. And so a lot of it did get delegated. I guess I took care of most of the budget things. With my lack of skill in business or arithmetic or anything else—I don't know why I did it, except that I guess he wasn't any better maybe!

But it was possible to delegate quite a lot. And Ed stayed very busy, and Warren Fox is doing the same. I think Becky delegated somewhat differently, and maybe wisely so. But it does help to have a full-time associate dean. And I think Arts and Science is the only college that does have a full-time asso[ciate]. Well, Agriculture has a series of them for different functions, but I think Arts and Science is the only one that has one who is a kind of associate for the dean, and that is justified because of the size.

I notice you mentioned budget preparation, work program preparation. That was done in the college much as it was on a University-wide basis; all the time I had a lot to do with it. It did involve a kind of process of working from the department level on through, which is probably a sensible way to develop budgets. There was increasing cynicism about the budgets because it was almost—every year I had anything to [do] with budgets, and maybe this has been a terminal problem almost—what happened is that you worked very hard to develop a budget, and then the legislature appropriated slightly less than enough to take care of the budget you'd had the year before, and it turned out you might just well have saved all that energy and time because there wasn't any money for it.

In a way, especially since Don Jessup has been working on the budgets, there've

been—and I think Al Knorr will continue it—in a way, there's been an attempt to get to something nearer zero-based budgeting and an actual justification of every expenditure every year, rather than a kind of historical scheme in which you take the budget of the year before and add ten percent and move from there. And I think that's going to become increasingly important as funds become even tighter than they have been the last few years, because if we're faced with actually cutting programs, then it's going to be very hard to decide which ones should go.

You know, a program like Oral History is a surefire candidate to be cut. So that the justifications have to be worked out for almost every sort of program. And it isn't going to be possible to cut 'em back a little bit or to cut some money or some staff on the different programs, and I'm glad I don't have to face that one because it does look to me as if—this year, unless something better happens in the legislature than seems to be happening, there will have to be some real cuts in the important places. And I don't know where you cut around here; I think most of the fat's gone long, long ago. And if Hap [Harold Morehouse] has to cut five spots in the library, I don't know where he's going to cut 'em. You know, you cut the Basque program; it doesn't save much. I suppose you can always cut out the reference department and have people do their own checking. Some things like that could happen, you know, but it isn't very easy. And it's silly, of course, to have to do it. You're just cutting out important services, I suppose.

Is it worse this year, do you think, than other years?

Yeah, I think so, for a couple of reasons. One, inflation has been slightly greater, and the governor's [Robert List] cuts are

heavier partly because he's relying so much on increasing tuition, both in-state and out-of-state, and that can be a double-barreled problem because increasing out-of-state tuition, for example, might very well reduce income rather than add to income. And the governor is taking the simplistic notion that if you increase out-of-state tuition twenty percent, you automatically increase your income twenty percent. And it's quite possible, as experience has shown, that you increase your out-of-state tuition by twenty percent and you decrease your income by ten, because you have fewer registrations. And so the chances of difficulty there are greater.

Another reason I think it's tougher this year is that for the past eight or ten years, we've sort of eaten up the "fat," if you want to call it "fat," that we had. For example, two years ago we had to cut ten positions. Well, we managed to cut ten positions without really hurting anybody; that is, you know, we found a quarter position over here in—someplace that had been on the books for a long time, but nobody'd filled, and so we used that as one position, and a half position here that nobody was really filling. It isn't that they were "fat" in the sense that there were a lot of positions and things we didn't need. It's just that they were positions that were on the books, and we hadn't filled them, so that really by just juggling figures two years ago, we were able to cut ten or a dozen positions which we—nobody had to be fired; nobody was cut. The years before we had done the same thing. And in addition, enrollments had been fairly stable.

Well, enrollments are now going up, and that becomes a third reason this year is more difficult because the increases in enrollment are not becoming substantial enough that we really need more staff, and when the staffs are being cut back, we're in real trouble. You

know, every time there're twenty-five more freshmen, you have to have a new section of freshman English—you ought to have more than one; you ought to have one and a quarter, at least—but you have to have one, at least. So that you get two hundred new students, and somewhere or other, you've got to find eight or nine new sections of freshman English, and that means more staff. And if they're not there, then something's going to have to be done. And I think again, the English department has probably been pushed about as far as it can go in giving up upper-division work in order to take care of the freshmen. I think in the last five or six years there was a lot at there that could be trimmed; that is, there were ways of combining upper-division courses and dropping some courses and so on and getting more sections of freshman out of the regular staff. But I think we've used up all that.

And so I think it is a tougher year. I don't know, the legislature may come through, be very generous, but I doubt it.

You were quoted in the Gazette in the legislature in '73.

Did I say the same thing?

I was researching for the Medical School, because you said that you disapproved of steady shifts in resources, that resulted in the Medical School getting a five hundred percent increase in state money last year and every other department taking a cutback.

Oh yeah, yeah. Well, that was a different kind of argument and a different kind of program. That was an internal argument. I think it was while Edd was still here, and yeah, he was very unhappy about that, but so was I. It was while I was dean of Arts and Science,

and I did sound off at a regents' meeting, as I remember, objecting to the way the budget had' cut back on the Arts college, particularly, and at the same time was booming the Medical School. Again, the Medical School was needing it; it was almost impossible not to give it to the Medical School, but I was making a pitch for the fact that 3.5 to 1 ratio in the Medical School seemed maybe necessary, but to justify that and allow, say, a 20 to 1 ratio in the rest of the University was maybe assigning priorities that ought to be questioned a little bit. But I remember I made Miller mad by talking to the legislature.

Oh, I remember even more about it now. Edd was out of town when the budget came. And I went to Jim Anderson, who was vice president, and told him that my department chairmen were upset, that I would have to talk at the regents' meeting; did he have any objections? And he, oh no, he just—if I had to, I had to. And so I did. But Anderson never told Miller when he came back that I was going to. So Miller was taken by surprise, and he was upset at what he thought was undercutting him. But I had told Anderson I was going to. And I think somebody else objected—oh, I guess the dean of Nursing maybe did. I can't remember.

Anyway, there was a kind of battle at the regents' meeting, which was a bad thing (it's always bad to indicate any kind of disagreement at a public meeting of that sort), except that I had tried to do something else about it and didn't get anywhere. So I did make noises at the regents' meeting [laughs]—not that I got anywhere.

The relations from the point of view of the dean's office—. It was harder than I had thought to maintain easy relations with the whole faculty when I was in the dean's office. I had thought that this would just work naturally, that you'd still see people all

the time and be there; but it is curious how quickly moving into an administrative spot arouses suspicion with some people. But with the people whom I knew well and were contemporaries and so on it was never there, but with young people I was, I think, looked on as “the dean” and with some suspicion.

I remember being very shocked when we did an evaluation business, which again I guess I started. We hadn’t had any kind of evaluation of a dean that seemed to be—well, the faculty liked the idea, too, that the dean be evaluated, but it seemed to be fair that if I was going to spend hours evaluating people, the dean ought to be evaluated. So they set up a committee and did get the returns. And the parts they did with checks, of course those things always turn out that you’re wonderful; everybody checks either “good” or “excellent” or something on those. But more interesting is they got comments—open-ended comments from some—and what I was shocked by was the number of times somebody would say that there’s never any chance to see the dean, or you can’t get into the dean’s office to see him, or the dean never answers any questions. And you know, I can’t remember ever not seeing anybody who dropped in the office, unless I had somebody there or something. But very frequently— and not only I, but when I was vice president looking at other deans’ evaluations—it seems kind of general that people have a feeling that the dean is inaccessible, no matter how accessible he is. And so there was that.

With chairmen, we had a regular meeting of all the college chairmen every month; Becky continued that practice, and it seemed a good scheme. And actually the department chairmen in the college are now formalized in the by-laws as a council of chairmen or something, and they do in a way a great deal of the business of the college. And they meet

regularly and are sort of the central group there. With other deans, well, just this fall, Joe started—or I think Dick Davies did—started formalizing a kind of change of change that we’ve been working on in the last couple of years, in which the academic deans meet as a group, and the old Academic Council, I guess, is now an Administrative Council or something and seems to meet less frequently and to get more done than the Academic Council did when I was chairman, I think. I think this is a much better system that they have worked out now. I’m not quite sure how they’re working it, but it seems to be doing better.

So then the academic deans would have functions like personnel, courses and curriculum, that sort of thing?

Well, there is a courses and curriculum committee that handles most of that. We started that when Milan came, and that’s one I approved of highly. I’d sat in the Academic Council too often and watched the log rolling there on both personnel and courses and curriculum. Nobody ever dared to check anybody else’s proposals because yours was coming up next! [Laughs] And so the Academic Council really paid very little attention to either of those matters. And so having a University personnel committee and University courses and curriculum committee seems to me an excellent idea, and it’s been working much better.

The academic deans started last year meeting just sort of informally almost every Friday morning for an hour or so. And it seemed a good idea. And it was not necessarily vote-taking or anything of that sort; it was just discussing matters of general interest, and I think it helped relationships among the colleges considerably. But it was

not formalized. Now I don't know whether Joe's formalized it this year or not; it's not in the code or by-laws anyplace, so I suppose it isn't totally formalized. But the Academic Council has had its personnel changed somehow or other, and I'm not quite sure what has happened to that. But it was, I think, relatively an ineffective body in the last few years, and it seems to have been working better with this revitalization.

I didn't see much of students, I guess, when I was dean and less as vice president, which is a kind of problem. Oh, you see em in formal ways, or you see the student body officers, this kind of thing. I did teach almost every year while I was dean or vice president, but except for that I just didn't see much of students. That's rather too bad, I think. Well, I saw the ones who had real problems, too, but not much of any others. But I don't know how you correct that. There just isn't time to do much. Teaching solves a lot of it, of course; you do at least see some students that way. But it's relatively hard to teach also, even though I think it's important that a dean—or any other administrator—I think it's important that they keep some teaching going. But it's hard to do it, partly because there are so many times when something that's immediately almost unavoidable comes up, and you have to miss a class. You can avoid it, and I've managed to do it, partly by setting up once-a-week meetings, usually, and just keeping those days inviolable, and I think I never missed a class most of the time I taught. Joe didn't miss one last year, I remember, when he was teaching a class. But you do have to set 'em up once. And I remember I thought of doing a freshman English class on a once-a-week experimental basis, and that was not a very successful experiment. They couldn't stay attentive for two and a half or three hours, and they wouldn't do any work until the night before,

so that it was not a very successful experiment, I think, even though it was supposedly an honors class, I remember! [Laughs] It's sort of hard to identify honors classes these days..

I can't remember what we did say about Sven [Liljeblad] I think we talked a little about his being at Idaho State for a long time, and that I had known Sven at Indiana before that. Sven was a good friend also, though, of Chariton Laird and actually a closer friend of Larry than of me. And Larry had known Sven at Idaho State after he got there, as well as casually at Indiana. So we did at various times over the years try to get Sven to come over in the staff of the English department. He finally came over, then, on a different business as Hilliard Professor—and I think I didn't say anything about that Hilliard professorship, which ought to be mentioned sometime or other.

Al Billiard was a regent of the University and a local attorney and a good friend of a number of staff members. He was the dissenting member of the board back in the days of the Stout affair and so on, and was usually a one vote against four on matters relating to the faculty or academic freedom or anything of that sort, so he was friendly with a lot of us on the faculty.

Then Al died—oh, I can't remember when, but he was survived by his widow, Emily Hilliard, who had an AB from the University, which she got, oh, in the late 1940s; she got her AB after I had come here on the staff, and as a mature woman. And Emily also was interested in the University, and Charlton Laird was a friend of Al and of Emily, and he became executor of the estate, and Emily did talk with Larry quite a lot before she died about how—what to do for the University. And Larry, I think it was, who advised her particularly, establishing some kind of professorial chair would be a good idea.

Well, it turned out there was not enough money to establish a chair, really. A chair these days costs, oh, at least half a million dollars to provide enough income for any kind of salary, and there was nothing like that in the estate. But there was enough to establish a kind of lectureship and annual conference-discussion fund, so that the Billiard Chair, which is administered by a committee on the campus—Laird, although he's retired, is still the chairman of the committee, and—oh, I can't remember now who else is on it. Ken Carpenter's on it, and Sessions Wheeler from the community is on it. I think Ellen Thompson's on it, wife of Judge Thompson. [William] Bill Scott maybe is on it. I think Sven Loevgren was on it, but he has probably not been replaced since his death. I'm on it. But that committee, which is operated on three or four meetings a year, has made the decisions on how the money should be spent, as recommendations to the president, of course, who does have final say on how it should be done.

Well, the first program, as I recall—I think this was the first—was a Walter Clark memorial series of lectures [1972], and for that series a number of speakers were brought in who in one way or another were friends of Clark or scholars who knew about his work—Bob Heilman from Washington did a talk on the western novel; Wally Stegner, who had been a colleague of Walter's at Stanford and knew him at San Francisco State, talked; Herb Wilner gave a kind of biographical sketch—he'd been a longtime friend of Walter's. I think Larry did a talk; I did a talk later. And then a part of the plan was—and still is—to fund publication of those lectures as a memorial volume to Walter. That volume has been edited; it is still in press somewhere or other. It's a University Press volume, and I don't know where it is. Larry edited it. And one of

its values is that Bob Clark, the son of Walter, commented at the end of every speech, and that stuff was all tape recorded. And a lot of that has been incorporated as comments. And Bob would know kinds of intimate details from discussions with his father that the rest of us didn't know, so a lot of the time that added to the value of the discussions. And it should be an interesting volume when it appears [laughs], if it does! I just have no notion what the stage of the publication is. It's been edited for some time.

Larry edited it [laughing] and then lost the manuscript! And it wasn't really lost; it was out in his garage in his not very efficient filing system, and he just overlooked it and finally found it. But that delayed it for a few months. And then there were delays, as there always are when you're trying to edit a lot of manuscripts that are scattered all over the country. And some of them were—Bob Clark had gone to Ely, Nevada and then to Montana after that, and one of the contributors is from University of Texas, and the others had moved around. So it always takes time to get the editing done on the manuscripts, although all the talks were originally in manuscript, so that that was part of the plan.

Well, anyway, after the Walter Clark thing, then we did get a notion of trying to get Sven here, as he had retired more or less at Idaho State—trying to get Sven here as the Hilliard Professor in languages and to get him to come over and with the only provision that he work on his Paiute materials while he was here. And this has turned out, I think, to be a very good—a very good arrangement both for Sven and for the University. If nothing else, just having Sven's collections of materials is worth more than the salary he's been paid while he's here. And more than that, he's been a fine influence around the campus. He's just a good enough scholar that it rubs off on

anybody who ever talks to him. He's widely admired. And he taught courses from time to time.

We occasionally got him over to teach a course before this Hilliard thing. And I remember Mary, my wife, still remembers Sven's course in folklore as the best course she had in the University. This was several years ago when he was here as a guest for just a semester, something of that sort. But he is a good teacher and obviously a good scholar.

And he's maybe coming closer—part of our notion was a kind of plot that by getting Sven here, we might get him to quite being so totally a perfectionist and get him to publish some of this stuff. But he still tends every time he's about to publish to think maybe he has not checked this last Paiute dialect someplace in Idaho and to think he needs a little more detail before he dares put it down in writing. And so he still, I think, is some distance from getting final publication on a lot of these things, and he's not a young man any longer, although he seems young a lot of the time [chuckles]. I can't remember how old Sven is, but he's over eighty, I'm sure. But he's very alert, and he—no, he seems fine. Oh, a couple of weeks ago Laird had us and Sven and Astrid out for dinner, and he seemed the youngest one there in lots of ways. [Chuckling]

Well, try deaning again. One of the sorts of questions that has been a question, and probably always will be, around the University administratively, is what the autonomy of the deans should be. And there's been a varying kind of attitude both among the deans and in the president's office about the role of the deans. It turns about various kinds of administrative problems. For example, one sort of controversial question always is the allocation of budget funds. A lot of the deans feel that they should simply be given a lump sum of money and then should have authority

to distribute that as they wish among their staff members and in their departments. With varying degrees this attitude extends to whether they should have autonomy in granting promotions and tenure and this kind of thing.

And on the other hand, there is an attitude which is held by a lot of the non-deaning members of the faculty, and in large measure, I think, by presidents who've gone through, that in order to preserve some kind of equality across the campus, this sort of autonomy just doesn't make any sense. But the result is, of course, that the dean has less authority than he sometimes feels he needs in order to administer the college in the proper way because he is restricted. Particularly, he's restricted on the question of promotion or merit increases for his staff and so on. And some of the deans feel that they can't properly reward and fail to reward their staff members if they don't have more autonomy there. As vice president, I think I did share the president's notion, and that of a lot of the faculty committees, that this kind of autonomy just would not work. And I think the evidence for that was pretty clear, because recommendations would come in from some colleges that everybody should be promoted, and everybody should have a double merit increase and so on. So that the deans tended—some of them—not to take or not to exert the authority they even had on recommendations; that is, it was much pleasanter to pass the buck on up, or to a committee.

And the committee system which we have—and which is much more elaborate here than in other places—the amount of faculty say and faculty control on promotion and tenure is quite unusual here, I think. We are very, very democratic, which I happen to like in some ways, except for the tremendous inefficiency of some of our promotion

machinery. The review and committee discussions and committee appeals and committee reconsiderations can go on it seems interminably, and I'm not sure produce any better results in the end. On the other hand, I don't know any way to avoid that and continue to have adequate faculty rights and faculty guarantees and representation. But it can get pretty annoying, eventually—and not just annoying to the administration—annoying to the committee members and everybody else. One of the things that tends to happen is that after every University committee has finished its functioning, there's a kind of reaction among the committee members that there is too much committee work and that the committeeing ought to be cut down, but it isn't likely to work that way.

One of the other manifestations of this problem of trying to allocate the dean's authority comes about in the connection with the dean's influence on general policy-making. A lot of the deans feel—and I think with some reason—that they are from time to time left out in major policy decisions, administrative policy decisions. The president, they feel, tends to rely on the people who are administratively closer to him—the vice president for business or the budget office, or the vice president for academic affairs—than on the opinions of the deans. And I think just as a natural, practical fact, this may be true, that the president doesn't consult or talk with the deans as frequently as he might, just as a matter of practical convenience.

And people have been aware of that, and we tried various devices while I was vice president and while I was dean, actually. For example, we supplemented the code and by-laws, which do provide for an administrative council, by having informal meetings of deans with the president. And that, I think, in some measure helped get the deans more aware of what the

general problems were and get the president more aware of the deans' points of view.

The Administrative Council, it seems to me, never worked terribly well, neither when I was a member of it or when I was chairman of it later. I think we tended to argue frequently on relatively minor points and not to come to conclusions that were very helpful to anybody or very decisive. There were exceptions; there were some instances in which the Administrative Council, which was a combination of academic deans and other administrators, there were some occasions in which it became very useful. But its functions over the years were generally varied, and actually its functions and responsibilities were gradually reduced over the years, and I think it was good.

I don't know that I said anything about the Academic Council before. It's been in one way or another in existence—I think I called it Administrative Council a minute ago, and I did that because it was that at one stage.

Long ago it was an administrative council; it was again, all the deans and other administrators plus two elected faculty members. That was true in the forties and before Stout; I think Stout abolished most of those committees. But it was originally that Administrative Council, and then it became the Academic Council, which was just all the deans. Ultimately, the president of the senate sat in as an ex officio member, and one of the most influential members, even though he was not a regular member of the council.

But the Administrative Council at one stage had, as perhaps its biggest function, passing on all promotion and tenure recommendations, all the personnel recommendations, and also passing on all curricular changes. Well, both of those functions got removed during the sixties, I think, and I think it was proper to remove them. The first to go were the

personnel things, and that, I think, was a very sound step because what you had in effect was the council in a way simply having a double shot at all these things.

That is, the deans were the persons making the recommendations, and then they became the group passing on them finally, so that inevitably, to some degree, it was a logrolling operation. I remember that in those days I was on the council as graduate dean a lot of the time, and Wendell Mordy was there as director of research, and the two of us used to get doubly exasperated because nobody else would ever raise any objections. And you can see why; you didn't object to the promotion of somebody else because yours was coming up next, and you wanted to get it through. And Mordy and I used to object to a lot of them because we didn't have any [laughing] axes to grind. But I think quite properly that function was taken from the council, and separate University personnel committees were established when the University by-laws were made, so that we have both a University-wide elected promotion committee and tenure committee and a University-wide elected merit review committee. And at least on promotion and tenure those committees, I think, function better than the Academic Council ever did.

And then the same kind of thing was true to a lesser degree in connection with course proposals. Again you didn't want to question a new course from Engineering if you had one coming up in the next motion from Arts and Science, so it became a kind of rubber-stamp committee. And the relatively recent—it was while I was vice president that we established a curriculum committee, it's called. And that committee, with one representative from each of the colleges, has taken over the function of passing on all courses, and it's a much more critical review that occurs there than ever

occurred with the old Academic Council review.

The deans, of course, also vary a good deal in the amount of autonomy that they want or the amount of autonomy that they have. Just by nature of the organization, some of the deans are able to preserve greater autonomy than others. Agriculture, partly from tradition and partly because so much of its funding and functioning is more or less directly under the federal government, Agriculture tends to have more autonomy than the other colleges, to vest more autonomy in the dean. And the dean can simply assume that because he—well, for one thing, he's always got the argument the federal government won't allow anything else, so whether that's true or not, it's always there! [Chuckles] And the other thing is that he does do a lot that's directly under the federal government. He has three or four hats; I've forgotten what all the titles are, but it's director of the statewide Extension program, and of the federal research programs, and so on. So those do operate as separate functions.

On the other hand, some of the other colleges have perhaps more outside funding that gives them a certain amount of autonomy in their financial arrangements. Mines, for example, does have quite a little outside funding. And even though that all has to be approved administratively, it does give them a certain flexibility. And so there are some differences there, as well, of course, as differences in the personalities of the deans, which always makes a difference.

There have been some fairly recent changes in the position of the deanships. One of these, again, is perhaps best reflected in Arts and Science, where I think I mentioned last time that I did when I became dean insist on a term, which I think the college faculty was very happy with; they were more enthusiastic about having a possible end to it

than I was! But I did want a term, and that was established in Arts and Science. Well, I think the other colleges don't have terms for the deanship established. The fact that Arts and Science does has made the lifetime tenure of the dean somewhat less certain than it used to be, and I think that's healthy.

The notion that a dean is a dean for life I think is a mistake. And there have been—oh, I don't know that there've been more frequent changes, except in Arts and Science where there've been natural ends to terms in the last few years. There still, I think, is a developing tendency to change deanships once in a while, and I think there's some hope that on a University-wide basis it will not be considered a disgrace to leave the deanship and become a professor for a while, so that you get almost a kind of rotation. And that feeling exists in Arts and Science more than it does in the other colleges, where—I guess most of the deans in the other colleges have been there quite a while. Bohmont in Ag, certainly, and Cain in Education, and Breese in Engineering not quite so long but quite a little while. And certainly one legislated difference now is that all deans have to be evaluated fairly regularly, and that is a change. Most of the evaluations have seemed to me not very critical, but they may have been made one way or another. And it becomes a way, at least, of reviewing the dean's position from time to time. So it's there.

I notice you have budget preparation on the list, and that, of course, is one function of the deans' offices. Unfortunately, in spite of all the theories, and the good intentions, and the practical working of the budget system (and again I think I remember mentioning this), in recent years it's become almost an academic exercise because of the tightness of funds, so that we have almost every year and every budget period certainly tried to start

with what's essentially a zero-based budgeting system in which every unit starting with the departments, every unit proposes and justifies what it thinks it really needs. And it goes through on that basis, without regard to what it had the year before; that is, it isn't just five- or a ten-percent increase. And I think that's a very important part of budgeting for something like a university campus or a federal government, for that matter, because various kinds of obvious inequities can develop fairly quickly when you work on a historical basis, and a lot of it has been done in that way.

Particularly, take two small departments in which the operating budgets are very, very low. But one year, English can justify getting two typewriters in the office and a Xerox machine for two thousand dollars. Well, in many years, when we were clearly working on a historical thing, that would get into the expenses for the English department that year, and so the operating budget would go up two thousand. And then it would be increased by ten percent. And that unusual expense was simply built in over and over. And it never happened to the English department that way, but in some departments there were really build-ups, so that two departments with about equal needs would have one budget twice as large as the other one just because of the little quirks of that kind. And those quirks, of course, could be much bigger; as soon as somebody caught onto the system, you could manage to get your budget pretty thoroughly inflated in a period of years, plus the ten-percent increments or whatever.

Well, we did in general give up the percentage-of-the-historically-based-budget thing, but on the other hand, you go back into a kind of zero-based, justified budget, and then you get the results from the legislature, and [chuckling]—and there isn't enough

money. So you end up really going back to practically what was there the year before or less, or something of that sort. And the whole effort begins to seem futile to a lot of people doing it, because you spend a lot of time recommending and justifying a certain kind of budget, and then there's no money to produce it, and after you've done that four or five times you get a little tired [chuckling] of the whole exercise. Still, one hopes, but you don't know. And it is hard to try to keep those things equitable.

And one thing that we did start doing—I think it was while I was dean, well, I'm sure it was—was putting a lot of the operating and equipment money into the dean's office rather than into the departments, as a way of trying to allocate the money more equitably on a basis of real needs rather than historically-established needs. So that, again, did not make departments all happy, especially those who'd had fairly substantial equipment budgets the year before, let's say [laughing], and didn't do it. But it did seem to work out better, and I think they're still doing that. And with limited funding, I think it helps. It's just hard in advance to figure out equitable ways of distributing all the funding among departments. And it's very hard to know how to distribute it, anyway.

Jim Anderson, I remember, tried to work out some formulas when he was vice president, and I thought they made a certain amount of sense. But they never were implemented, and I think partly there never was enough money to implement them. But they simply worked on a kind of basis that any department with so many people needed so much as a kind of basic operating procedure: that you needed enough to pay for a telephone, and you needed enough to pay for one typewriter or one or a half secretary, this kind of thing. You could work it out fairly well on that basis. But

the problem was that frequently there wasn't enough money to fund even that [laughs], and you didn't have to worry then about the supplementary things that came in. But some such formula might still be a useful thing.

How did you, as dean, deal with allocating funds?

Well, you simply had to use what judgment you had. Most of the time there just wasn't enough money to do it. On things like, staffing, always as dean I could go to the vice president and argue that out of whatever contingencies were available, we had to have some additional T.A.'s or additional staff to staff the programs. And I think both when I was dean and vice president, that was kind of first priority; we tried never to turn students away from classes.

Now it sometimes happened by accident—and that isn't quite true. There were some classes, for example, oh, photography used to boom every semester, and we just didn't have enough people to staff it, even if we had money to hire them, so people who wanted the photography class just had to wait sometimes after a certain number of sections had gone. And the same was true of racquetball, for example, where we always were running out of staff for racquetball and of courts also. But when biology came in and could show me that they had—well, when they could come in first and say, "All our lab sections are filled. What do we do?"

Then I would say, "You go ahead and fill some more, if you think you can hire staff if I can get the money," and they would.

And I would then go yelling for money for more staff, and knowing that I could get it. That is, it was a kind of informal deal with the president and vice president that they knew I was not going to be yelling for staff

just for the fun of it, and that we did not want students to be kept out of laboratory. So that this happened almost every fall and every spring that we would be short on lab sections in biology, and lab sections in chemistry, and freshman English sections. And so we'd have to try to hire some additional staff. And we normally even budgeted enough—when I was vice president, we budgeted enough to take care of that, knowing that it was going to happen, but not being sure where it was going to happen at any given time, and not wanting to staff it until after the actual registration came.

On equipment and that kind of thing, one of the things I did start when I was dean was what we called an apportionment committee. And that on both staffing and work programming was a committee that made recommendations on allocations of funds, both work program and budget. Originally, it was an appointed committee; I think it was appointed from department chairmen. And that again tended to have the same disadvantages the old Academic Council had had, in that here were all these people who had their own needs that they wanted to push for, but also were making a decision. So it was very hard, even though in all those meetings, I remember, the chairmen were trying very hard to be totally objective about it. They tended either to lean over backward in not pushing their own needs or they tended to push their own needs without realizing it, so that ultimately it became a—I can't remember if it was while I was dean or afterward—but ultimately it got into the college by-laws as an elected committee, and I think it's worked better that way.

And that's been a very helpful group. I'm sure it was helpful to Becky even more than it was to me because of the need for making some staff cuts later. While I was

dean, I think we didn't have to make any cuts. We did have problems in allocating the one or two positions we'd get every year. But it was very helpful not only because it took some of the heat of f the dean, but because it helped the dean make a wiser decision, when that committee could look at where the needs actually were greatest. And so that committee did advise the dean on making those decisions. And I think it's still operating that way in Arts and Science. I don't think any of the other colleges do it, but Arts and Science in many ways is different from the others just because it's so much bigger. There are twenty departments, something like that, so that it presents problems that the other colleges don't really have, and that they can handle more easily centrally than Arts and Science. Plus the fact that Arts and Science has not only this great variety of departments but a considerable difference in the nature of some of the departments.

There are at least three or four departments which think of themselves primarily as professional departments, almost vocational departments: social services and corrections; criminal justice; journalism; and to, well, lesser degrees or in a different way, I guess, art and maybe music think of themselves as, not professional in the same way quite, but in a different way professional, I think. And then there are the other departments in humanities and social sciences and sciences which don't think of themselves as professional or vocational at all. And it's fairly hard to administer those departments in an equitable way and still take care of their different kinds of needs and goals, and also to manage the feelings that exist in the sort of professional departments that the rest of 'em don't understand them and the other departments are putting demands on that shouldn't be there, and the feeling in

the more academic departments that these people [are] interlopers and have no business in the college because what they're doing is not really university stuff, but is kind of trade school stuff. Well, you get those two differing views, and it does make some real problems in connection with promotion and curriculum in all sorts of ways.

And there have been at various times pressures to break up the college in different ways. There's always been a kind of movement to move social services and criminal justice someplace else, except nobody knows where to move them, and when they get down to it, where else would they go to be better? Establishing a separate college, which they sometimes talk about, would also be awkward. There's talk of a school of journalism all the time, which a lot of places have, which we're maybe pretty small for. At one stage there was some agitation—well, two or three times there's been agitation for a separate natural science college.

Las Vegas is divided up somewhat differently from us, and I can't remember now quite what it is, but I think they have a college of natural sciences, maybe. And they may have a fine arts college. Yeah, I think they do. And then the arts and letters college is another smaller one. But they have quite different divisions from ours, and so do a lot of other places. And then the other thing that has been suggested here, of course, is a fine arts college, which would be art and music and maybe theater, something like that.

But every time these proposals get pushed a little bit toward actual details, people seem to back off and think that they like the size, and consequently, the power that the large college has. And it makes a certain amount of sense. Plus the fact that from an administrative point of view, it costs money every time you add a new dean's office, and there isn't, perhaps, a real need for it.

Usually the movements stem from a feeling in some group that they're not getting their fair share of the pie, or they're not being treated properly—and sometimes it's true, I suppose [chuckles]. I can't remember what the science people got upset about; I think it was while Kirk was dean that they got worried that they weren't being treated properly, and that they would do much better if they had their own dean and their own pressure groups and so on. And it didn't work.

Well, it's a perennial problem, of course, what should be a teaching load. And in Arts and Science at least, the dean always has had a function of passing on the teaching load. And when I was department chairman, all along whenever I turned in a schedule, I turned in with it, at the dean's request, a listing of each faculty member and what his teaching load was for the semester; and if there were any notable variations, I had to justify them. And I think that's always been true. When I was dean, there were variations which I did insist on having justifications for, and which I probably let go with insufficient justification a good deal of the time (that is, some of the variations). On the other hand, I did have rationalizations in principle always for most of those variations.

The thing that they have hit upon now is something that was proposed long before that I've always thought was good. I don't know, actually, what the status of it is, but I do know that the president did finally—during this or last semester (I've forgotten which) —and I think he used the phrase when he mentioned it to me, say he had finally “bit the bullet,” and did send out a kind of ultimatum that the fifteen-credit work load would be the basis for establishing work loads throughout the campus.

Now people objected to that when it was—actually it was proposed at one time

by Chancellor Humphrey in a very elaborate sort of point system, and people objected enough to that that the whole thing bogged down. Various code committees that I have been on have proposed similar things over a longer period of time. But it seems to me to make sense to work out some kind of general allocation in which you say a fifteen-credit load is sort of basic. And then you say for most people three of those credits are taken up in committee work, in University work, and so on; and if they can demonstrate that they're doing it that way, then that means they would have only twelve hours teaching. For most people, three hours also would be devoted to scholarship, to research, to faculty improvement, this kind of thing, so that the normally-active faculty member justifies three credits there, so that nine hours of teaching becomes a kind of standard load.

Well, you can then justify the variations from that. For example, you can say that somebody who has no duties whatsoever, except teaching a class—say, an assistant or a part-time teacher, who has no duties whatsoever except meeting that class—would have the load established on a fifteen-credit basis. Not that you would hire such a person to teach fifteen credits, but that if the person is teaching half-time, you could expect him to do, say, six credits, or six and seven credits, something like that—if they have no other duties whatsoever. Or you could even say that in a department in which no research was part of the responsibility, or for somebody who refused to do any committee work, that that person might teach twelve hours, something of that sort. And you do have a few twelve-credit teaching loads floating around, but not very many. Usually, it's a way of justifying part-time appointments, and in some ways because the salaries are so low it's really a device for exploitation, I think, but it does work.

Then the other thing you can do—and I did some of this while I was dean, as a way of encouraging promising people to do research—if you can find a place and a semester in which the teaching requirements are not terribly heavy, and if the department's willing to take up the slack, I did as dean, with some frequency, justify dropping not just the three credits out of the fifteen but six credits out of the fifteen for research, so that a person might have a load of only six credits in order to do a lot of research or graduate supervision, something of that sort.

That got out of hand, I think; Becky picked that up and was much more generous with it the first year or so she was dean. And I think it got out of hand in some departments. Some of the departments that were facing low enrollments—departments in the humanities—could stand some cuts, and Becky did put several people on these special research programs. And they were, of course, supposed to justify what they did, and she did insist on their demonstrating that they were doing the research. And I think most of them did do the research, but at the same time it got loads cut down to the extent that—well, freshman English was suffering, for one thing. And also, very quickly this became not a one-shot deal, but became a kind of right of the faculty members to have their loads cut, and it was hard to break the pattern.

It's also true that some of the departments doing heavy research—chemistry, for example—had quite a number of people on six-credit loads. But almost always, when that occurred, I thought I could justify the lower load in terms of the research productivity of the faculty members. It's not universally true, and I made a number of mistakes in which somebody got a low load and didn't do anything. But by and large, it worked well and is a way—I think in actuality, a person isn't

going to do any more research on a six-credit load than a nine-credit load or ten-credit load; if he wants to do the research and is really interested, he's going to do it, no matter what the load is. But at the same time, it frequently is psychologically enough motivation to have the load reduced that it does stimulate some greater activity. So it seemed to me a good idea on the whole.

But I think the approach that the president is now taking of getting a work load established on the basis of a fifteen-credit duty or role or something is one that's likely to fly with the public, and at the same time fit in the pattern of what happens, and is also fairly realistic. If you say fifteen credits involved one hour of presentation of some kind, plus two hours of preparation for it—that is, one credit is a three-hour commitment—then you've got a forty-five-hour week, which is a reasonable work week.

And I noticed in the North Las Vegas Valley-Times, a couple of weeks ago, there have been columns by a man named Johns, who I think formerly was on the staff at UNLV and is now obviously dismissed, and bitter about it. But he has a column in the Valley-Times, and among other things, he's been simply violently vituperative about the lazy, loafing faculty at UNLV, particularly— And he had one column on the results of a work load study; I hadn't seen the study and I'm not sure what he was talking about, but he said it came out with a fifty-five-hour average work week for the faculty. And he simply just called names for the whole column—a bunch of liars and loafers—just one thing after another [laughing] in there, which is difficult. I don't know.

You know, you get curious variations in the way people fill out those work load studies, but I think probably a fifty-five-hour week for a faculty member is not impossible by any

means. You know, if you really count in the time that you spend in preparation, in self-development, and this kind of thing, it's there. Now, it's true that you can argue that reading Time magazine is not necessarily study and preparation; on the other hand, you can argue that it is, particularly in some fields. So some of that fifty-five hours may be questionable stuff, but most of the time a faculty member puts in quite a lot. A freshman English teacher who reads papers all day Saturday and Sunday just almost certainly puts in the fifty-five hours. And when I was young and vigorous, I certainly worked almost every night—not with any compulsion. And the reason you stay in teaching is that you work the nights you want to, and you don't work the nights you don't want to, but you get in a lot of time, or you don't get anything produced. And I think most conscientious faculty members do a lot of that. And there are, obviously, people who find it a pretty soft job, but that's true in any business or any kind of institution.

Well, should we look at the vice president outline a little bit? I don't know how much of this we've actually talked about. The selection process, of course, was an interesting one here, and I stayed out of it as much as possible. The problem with that whole business is a problem that I think is built into the new Affirmative Action procedures and so on, which I approve of, generally, and which I think have done quite a lot of good. On the other hand, they do have the effect of discouraging what the policy itself calls "upward mobility" (whatever that may mean), and in effect, making it difficult for anybody to move within his own institution, so that the tendency is that you trade deans with institutions, or you move from one place to another—is the only way of advancing, which is inefficient, I think. Now it's true that the Affirmative Action policy does have a provision for upward mobility,

but it's one that isn't easily defined or easily recognized. And that was involved in my appointment as vice president.

You remember Jim Anderson had left the vice president's office after a year. And he and Milam just didn't operate in the same way at all. And then Milam went on for a year without a vice president, and during that year, as dean of Arts and Science, we did work pretty closely together. Just inevitably, that's true: the dean of Arts and Science is dean of the biggest college [and] has a lot to do with the president at almost any time. And at various times during that period, he sounded me out on whether I wanted to be a vice president or not, which I tended to say No to. And I think he didn't formally ask me if I would be or not. Well, maybe he did a couple of times; I said No. But finally, I did during the end of that year say, well, yeah, I would do it for a year or two if he wanted me to.

Well, I did say that I would not be acting vice president. I think I mentioned before that acting administrators have always seemed to me nonsense. If you're going to do the job, it seems to me you would do it, not do a holding operation or something of that sort. And he agreed with that. So he did check with Harry Wolf, the Affirmative Action officer; and Harry Wolf checked with the San Francisco office, and they did make it very clear that if the president could assert that there was someone on the campus whom he would be willing to accept, and who was qualified for the vice presidency, then all he needed to do was a local search before making the appointment, which would give everybody on the campus a fair shot at it. But if the president could assert that he didn't have to go outside, that there was at least one qualified candidate on the campus, then he didn't have to go outside.

Well, this was all cleared with the San Francisco office and with Harry Wolf, the

local Affirmative Action officer, and it was all there. And Milam did advertise the position. When he did it, as I recall, he didn't do it publicly, but he did to various people around the campus say that since I had agreed that I would be a candidate, he could do just the local search. Well, somebody decided that this [was] giving me an unfair advantage, which it obviously was, and which he intended, but which, again, was perfectly legal as far as he could find out. But I can't remember—various kinds of things happened. One of them, somebody got hold of a secretary in the San Francisco office—some reporter—and the secretary didn't know about what had gone on before and made some kind of statement that this was illegal. And so there was a big newspaper story there, which Harry Wolf again corrected by getting a different quote from the San Francisco office. But by that time, of course, the damage was done. I don't know that the regents ever got in the act much. But an English instructor—maybe she was assistant professor by that time—a woman named Tippy Campbell, whom I'd known a long time in Las Vegas—I can't think of her real—Felicia, maybe, Campbell?

I believe it is. But anyway, young Tippy had been an English instructor for a long time and had finally gone of f—I don't know whether she ever got her degree or not—I think she did. But anyway, she decided she wanted to be vice president, so she applied, and Al Stoess down in the chancellor's office applied. Well, those and I were the three applications. Milam appointed a search committee to go over those. Another mistake that he probably made was making Bob Harvey chairman of it. And people were more aware than Milam that Harvey and I had been good friends for many years, and I'm not sure Milam even was aware of that, although he probably was to some extent. But anyway, that irked some

people. Harvey did, I think, a conscientious, objective job doing it. But those were the only three applications he got.

The committee looked at Felicia Campbell's application to decide that it was silly to bring her up here for an interview, that she just didn't fit. They did interview both Al Stoess and me and did, as far as I can remember, do it conscientiously. I seem to remember a two- or three-hour interview in which I was asked all sorts of fairly difficult questions, and then the committee did recommend that I be appointed, and Milam did. And I don't think he had any trouble with the Board of Regents on it, although I can't remember now—maybe he did.

Helen Thompson?

Oh, that's right. Helen [Thompson] decided that Max had used the wrong procedure, that he had violated Affirmative Action procedures on it, and Helen did raise some fuss. And I guess Helen resigned soon after that, and maybe it was ostensibly because of that, that she resigned—I don't know. I do remember it now, and I do remember that she talked to me about it and pointed out that it had nothing to do with me, and we would remain friendly. In fact, she made a donation to travel and sent it directly to me soon after that, for the University, and remained friendly. So I think she was honest about thinking this was a matter of principle, and she objected to what the president did then. And I can't remember whether she had much support or not; I just can't remember. I think the appointment went through the first time Milam presented it; I don't think there was any problem in getting the board's approval. But there was that objection from Helen Thompson. I think probably, too, she was a friend of Tippy Campbell, and that that may have had something to do with it in Vegas.

And then Campbell did sue. I don't know whether it was a civil suit or whether it was an appeal through the federal agencies, and I think that's still hanging fire someplace or other. I never got involved in the suit at all, and I don't know anything about what happened there; but I know she did register some kind of formal suit or complaint, and it seems to me Larry Lessly mentioned to me just the other day that it was still litigation of some sort. And her pitch was that since she had not been interviewed, she was not treated equally, and this was based on sexual discrimination. And there's no evidence whatsoever that it was, as she'd had no administrative experience, as far as I can remember—had no other qualifications, particularly; and I think the committee just thought it wasn't worthwhile having her there.

Anyway, that really never affected me very much; I just paid almost no attention to it, since I wasn't really eager for the job, and it didn't matter to me one way or another, and Max did push it through. And I don't think, except for Helen Thompson, that there was much difficulty. That is, I don't think the people who later became Milam's enemies were upset much over that; I don't think that had much to do with it, but it may have.

The vice president's job had varied in a number of ways over the years. Ralph Irwin, for example, was a vice president in a kind of staff position; that is, it was not a line position with Irwin. He made no decisions and was simply a—well, it was more like an assistant, really, than a vice president. Although he did do a great deal of work, particularly on personnel things, it was not a line position.

When Anderson was appointed vice president, it was sort of in between. There was never any real certainty about what his role was. It was a line position, but at the same time it was sort of advisory, and he did,

I think, feel compelled to check almost every decision with the president before making it, and so on. I think Max's notion was that it should be more clearly a line position; and my responsibilities were never outlined very clearly in writing, but Max and I talked enough to make it fairly clear that he expected me to make decisions with the deans, to make decisions on personnel matters and so on, and to check with him when I wanted to, but that most of the time I was responsible for what went on in the colleges and for the academic programs and so on, and also for some allocation in the budget, although that was always jointly done. So that we did have the job outlined fairly clearly, then. And with Crowley, the same kind of arrangement worked.

Milam and I, I think, never operated in quite the same way; that is, he was a much more intense, nervous, I guess energetic person than I was, you would say, in many ways. And he tended to push things faster and less patiently than I would have. And we worked together fairly well by tolerating each other in different [chuckling] ways, and then we got along very well always and were good friends as well as working together.

I thought he was a very good president. And I think I mentioned—I seem to remember saying this earlier—that I never quite understood why the faculty felt that he was cold, or felt that he was impersonal, or felt that he was not concerned about faculty affairs. I never really understood how he gave that impression, but he did. There was no doubt about it that the faculty felt pretty much—or a lot of the faculty, at least—felt left out. And there was almost from the beginning quite a lot of resentment against Milam from the faculty—not significantly so, and it improved, of course, as the tenure and his presidency went on and he got to

knowing more faculty members and working with them. But he did have opposition in the faculty senate, and most of it on a basis that I didn't really understand, that Milam was not concerned about the faculty and what went on. And I found the contrary almost always true. But the difference was there.

I guess I have never been a favorite son of the Board of Regents (maybe that's a good state of affairs). On the other hand, except for this last board, the Bucky Buchanan board, it seems to me all—. Well, no, the Si Ross board—that was not a friendly relationship either. But with some of the other boards where there was a lot of difference of opinion, it was all fairly friendly difference of opinion. For example, Bill Morris and Mel Steninger on the board used to be just as unhappy with everything I said; and I was dealing with the board a lot, then, because I was chairman of a code committee. And Steninger and Morris and I used to yell at each other at practically every meeting. And Steninger and Morris tried to fire Edd Miller, and I got up in arms about that. But at the end of it, we were always friendly. I saw Mel in Elko during the campaign; we're still friendly. And I see Bill Morris all the time; in fact, Bill and I used to yell at each other at regents' meetings, and then Bill would insist on buying drinks all night afterward! And it was totally different attitude from this more serious kind of intrigue business that was going on with them at the time of Milam's dismissal and Bucky Buchanan's maneuvering. Oh, Bucky was ostensibly friendly in a way; he never was, really. And he was always manipulating something, and I guess still is, from all I can find out.

* * * * *

Well, let's see. We talked about the Academic Council a little. I don't know

whether I've said anything about the faculty senate anyplace or not.

Not really.

I don't think maybe I did. I guess the senate was established after—I don't know what years, really, but it was sometime after the Stout debacle, because we were left really without any kind of faculty governance, then. Stout had abolished the faculty machinery to all intents and purposes. I remember he referred to the faculty meetings that we ought to have one once in a while, and he referred to it as a "wailing wall." [Chuckles] And he did occasionally call a meeting of the faculty in which he made a little speech. But there wasn't any machinery for faculty governance.

After Stout was gone, a committee did work out a machinery for a faculty senate, and I think it's essentially the machinery that still exists. I associate Maurice Beesley with the committee that did that, and I think he was chairman of it. I can't remember whether I was on the committee or not. I'm pretty sure I was in the first senate, and on the senate at various times other than that.

The senate has had a kind of period of varying influence, depending partly on the makeup of the senate. It has never, I think, really become an effective legislative or judicial representative of the faculty. I think it's become—well, I think the most critical thing I could say about it—and this is a kind of exaggeration—is that it's tended to become powerful, but to become powerful largely as a kind of faculty grievance committee or faculty welfare group. That is, it's tended rather than becoming a kind of overall policy and judgment arm of the faculty, a kind of wise, elder statesman sort of policy-making group, it's tended to be an advocacy group for welfare. Now that's a useful function, and

I'm not meaning that to be derogatory, but I think it's never become quite as significant a policy-making group as it ought. And it tends to spend more time and energy on questions of salary and faculty rights and tenure-promotion things than it does on larger academic problems. That is, the questions of curriculum or questions of policy do come to the senate and do get attention, but I think relatively less concern is expressed there than in the more immediately effective or affecting kinds of operations like teaching loads or so on.

I haven't been to senate meetings this year, but I should guess that there's been much consternation and discussion of the faculty-load problem. And that's right, there should be; it's a kind of question that ought to be solved there. But I think that's much more likely to get their attention than, oh, what—I can't think what a big overall problem]. Well, even something like where budget cuts ought to be made, what academic programs ought to be cancelled if we have to cut programs—a tougher kind of problem in many ways and one that the senate may have difficulty with.

Some of the senate committees have been the most effective parts of the senate operation. And again, this depends largely on the personnel. The so-called 107 committee, however, which is essentially a budget and planning committee, that committee has been a very hardworking and useful committee, and it has, I think, come closer to concerning itself with really basic problems, quite apart from the self-interest of the members or of the senate or of the colleges. It's become much more a kind of policy advisory group than any other part of the senate, and it seems to me it's done very good work the last six, seven, five years—along there.

One of the other problems I see with the senate is that it's remained—at least from some

colleges—a group that’s very conscious of its representative status. That is, the members have thought of themselves as representatives of the faculty, more than wise people making decisions or judgments on the basis of their understanding. Now that’s a distinction that is hard to justify either way. And it varies a lot. Some of the senate members over the years have felt very strongly on this because they’ve been pressured by their deans or by their faculties to make decisions in certain ways which went against their conscience.

At one stage in the senate by-laws and maybe in the code, I remember, there were attempts to phrase a statement about the duties of the senate members which would free them to vote their conscience on any matter. And I think some such sentence still exists in either the by-laws of the senate or the by-laws of the University, and the only difficulty is it’s very hard to phrase this kind of thing. You know, it’s like saying everybody ought to be honest or something of that sort. But it is there because—particularly in Agriculture there were some occasions in which senate members were apparently pressured to vote a certain way and thought they should not and that kind of thing. And then others got into the act. The fact is that in some colleges, though, the senate member does feel that most of his function there is to push the case of his particular college or his particular department, rather again than trying to look at the overall problems of the University. And I think that attitude in a fairly considerable number of the senators has weakened its effectiveness. But it’s an interesting procedure, and it’s rather interesting that it’s existed in this form as long as it has, because it’s not the same as that of a lot institutions. For example, many universities even larger than Nevada have a senate consisting, say, of all associate and full professors with then, obviously,

the executive committee that has to do the functioning. But it is clearly a less democratic kind of arrangement than this one because frequently, very young staff members get onto the senate or get in positions of having some influence, and I think that does spread the representation.

There is a growing—well, I don’t know that it’s growing, but there has always been a kind of attitude expressed by a fair number of people around the campus that the senate doesn’t represent them. That’s particularly true in some of the professional schools, in which they feel that the senate is dominated by Arts and Science, and is a radical group and doesn’t really represent what the faculty members want. That is not a majority opinion, I think, but you hear from time to time that—well, whenever somebody wants to be promoted and has to go through the committees, and the committees turn it down, they can come into the vice president’s to complain. And the vice president’s only answer is, “But that’s what the senate has voted,” or “That’s the code,” or “That’s the system; those are the by-laws; your representatives have made it that way.”

And with great frequency, you then get the view, “Well, the senate doesn’t represent me!” [Laughs] And it may be true, I don’t know.

The NSP [National Society of Professors]—I just don’t [know] anything about it; I’ve never been a member of NSF. And I guess I feel that NSF may be a very useful thing now, just because AAUP [American Association of University Professors] has seemed to lose its campus influence. I think it’s too bad to split the faculty welfare organizations; I think that one of them—either NSF or AAUP—probably is enough, and that one would be stronger if it weren’t split. I was in administration by the time NSP was established. I didn’t join it; I was a member of AAUP from the time I started teaching and president of it and various other

things, and even had an appeal registered in my name, which was successful, over the Stout affair. So I believe in such organizations.

I do not think that it would be healthy to have faculties unionized, unless there are reasons greater than any around Nevada at the time. I don't think that a union is necessary or useful. And by that I mean a union for a college faculty only. I'm in favor of unions generally and a longtime union supporter, but it does seem to me that a university is a different enough kind of organization that unionization detracts from the basic professionalism that I think is necessary if you're going to have a good faculty, and that if you cannot maintain faculty responsibility and faculty rights through a collegial model, then we're really in a very baa state. And I think there are places in which I'm sure I would vote for a union and be part of it. And I would vote for a union under the Stout regime at Nevada. But the way things are now, I rather think that a faculty has as much control—probably more control, more say—than it would have under a union.

At Nevada, now I'm talking about only that I can't see really how a faculty could have or could want any more policy say than it has now. And I doubt that union pressures would provide any more salary than we're getting now. It's possible—certainly NEA [National Education Association] has been pretty successful in pushing for more salaries for secondary teachers—and it might be possible that it could lobby more successfully on salaries than the current Board of Regents-administration approach. But I'd be a little surprised in Nevada if it would do much better on salaries, even. And on everything else, I don't think there's any need for a union at this time, and that the results of union control would be far worse than the benefits that would be gained.

On the other hand, I think that either NSP or AAUP as a faculty rights pressure group is a very useful sort of thing. And I just don't know enough about what NSP has been doing because I've never been to a meeting, as a matter of fact—except cocktail parties.

Did you have relations with them from the vice-president point of view—pressure or anything like that?

No, not very much. I think the NSP people almost always talked to the president rather than me; I don't know quite why. And as far as I know, there never were any really strong disagreements. Oh, every once in a while, NSP would feel it hadn't been informed about something, I think, and probably hadn't been, but it usually [was] negligence rather than any attempt at secrecy. And I think most of the time that I—I remember when NSP was upset about something, the president was, too. And [laughing] it was an attempt to work together. So I never had any kinds of controversial discussions with NSP that I can remember. There must have been some instances in which on individual personnel matters NSP took a stand and sent a representative—I'm sure there are some now, and I can't for the moment think of a specific example. I'm almost certain there were some. But any kind of controversial personnel matter always had various groups involved in one way or another. Hm! It's funny, I can't remember. Let's see, Jerry Edwards was president for a while, and—who was before that, I wonder?

I can't even think who the presidents were of NSP. Jerry Edwards came into the office a lot while he was president, but it was always—he was always friendly and always—I think usually just inquiring about things, and—. And I don't remember who has been president

of AAUP for a long time. It's not been very active, I think.

Well, let's see, we've talked a little about the new course review, which I mentioned, personnel decisions, Affirmative Action, hiring policies—I think they've been—well, I think the overall effect has been really very good, mostly in changing attitudes nationally. That is, I can remember times that—well, I can remember a couple of instances; I remember one department chairman pounding the table and saying there would be no women in his department and he'd see to it and there weren't. And it was a department where there could have been women (this is twenty years ago, I suppose, but it was true then). And I remember a dean pounding on the table at me and saying he would have no Jews on this faculty, and that was his prejudice, and he was entitled to it, and there would be no Jews while he was dean. That was only about three months before I sneaked Milton Miller past him [laughing] by holding out part of his biographical data sheet. And ironic—this was old Dean Fred Wood, who's now dead—but ironically, Milton turned out to be his son's teacher. Fred Wood never knew he was a Jew until long afterward, but he turned out to be his son's teacher, and his son thought he was the best teacher he'd ever had. And Wood used to praise Milton to me [laughing] all the time! And he found out he was a Jew sometime, but he didn't say much about it.

But I think even nationally, the attitude has shifted so that I think the tendency to appoint minorities or women is much greater. The details of the thing are exasperating sometimes and I think are much too complicated, but I guess I don't object to them because I'm not sure how you can get the general effect without having the little details. For example, having to circularize two hundred and fifty places that cater for blacks and women on every

appointment—a circular is utterly silly most of the time; you just know there isn't going to be anybody at most of those places. And there isn't. And for some jobs, maybe it's all right, but others not, so that you're really in a way prohibited from doing what's common sense on 'em, and it costs a lot of money and a lot of time and a lot of nuisance. So that many of the details of the Affirmative Action policy are annoying, but the overall effect, I think, has been very good. I don't really know whether there have been more women appointed at Nevada or not, but there certainly have been more women candidates seriously considered and offers made to women. A lot of women have turned down offers largely because they're in positions to have more offers, and the best women candidates, often, we haven't been able to get. And there've been pressures; there were objections from Arts and Science chairmen when Becky was made dean of Arts and Science. And I think I mentioned that Milam and I did go against committee's number one recommendation in appointing her, and—.

I'm not sure you did.

I'm not sure I did either, now. But it's true that the committee—it wasn't a firm ranking, but the committee had slightly preferred a man who—I've forgotten—who was a mathematician, I think, from somewhere—the committee had slightly preferred him over Becky. And the Arts and Science chairmen had vehemently opposed having a woman and had even suggested that that was one of the problems—that they didn't think they could work with a woman dean. That was all done informally, but it was done in the discussion. And then their recommendation was for the other candidate. And I certainly don't think that I made my decision on the basis of

whether Becky was a woman or not; I think I made it on the basis of thinking she was a good administrator and a good scholar, and I think Max did the same thing. But I think we also did not take the attitude that since she was a woman, she wouldn't be any good [laughs], so—.

What about the Catherine Smith affair—?

Well, yeah, the Catherine Smith affair—I think the whole thing was a little amazing. I never did know what all went on with Catherine Smith's affair. I am convinced, however, that Catherine Smith has tenure that she did not deserve. The whole affair with the charges back and forth got so petty that it was silly. And Catherine would be in the office one day with this kind of charge, and I would try to check it out, and I would get countercharges that Catherine had done this or Catherine had done that. The kinds of things were just utterly silly. This started when I was dean, and Catherine was constantly complaining. So far as I could tell from the facts, Catherine never was really hired in any kind of regular position and was never promised any kind of regular position, but she always wanted one.

And then what Catherine did was take advantage of the system, which was wrong. But she took advantage of it in ways that I think were not fair of Catherine. That is, what she would do is get a three-credit appointment at a regular part-time salary, and then she would try to maneuver another—well, would maneuver—well, maneuver isn't the right word—she'd be offered and would also seek, say, some private lesson funds at a different kind of salary scale. And then if another class became open, she would take that. Well, she'd end up with something close to a full load on these different part-time jobs. And each time she'd be given them because the department chairman

needed somebody to do it, but also because she wanted it and he thought it was doing her a favor.

Well, Catherine was right in observing that this was a very irregular way to do salaries. And the music department had been doing all sorts of strange things. That is, they'd been paying the people to teach private lessons at whatever the private lessons tuition fee was; they'd been doing them on letters of appointment at three hundred dollars a credit or something, and then they'd been also doing part-time contracts at a portion of, say, an assistant or instructor salary. And Catherine was having jobs at all three of these bases.

Now, in other words, technically, Catherine was right in saying that she was being hired on different salary levels, but she was being given these jobs as a favor to her, and she was obviously taking advantage of them. But she never really had a full-time appointment in the music department. It was always a putting-together of two or three kinds of part-time appointments. But she did have, technically, a discrimination case on the grounds of being paid for the same work at different scales, which she was, so that she made a case there. Well, that was the technical part of her case at work.

The rest of it—the discrimination—I never understood, and some of it was so petty. After she got the job, there were hours of arguing because her office didn't have a window in it, and somebody else's did. And it was always on that kind of basis, or this person had been offered that course and she hadn't. And she was in constant difficulty there. She and [Merle G.] Puffer managed to call each other liars every twenty minutes or so, and I suspect they were both right—I don't know. But there was a great deal of that kind of thing going on.

And Catherine finally I guess—Catherine did start a suit, finally. The music department

had voted against her tenure on the grounds that she wasn't qualified. Well, what [chuckles]—what happened, then, is that we decided to settle it out of court. She got an attorney; Phyllis Atkins was her attorney, I think—I remember doing a deposition for Phyllis. And there were all sorts of, again, strange charges and countercharges, that people were prejudiced against her because she was a woman, and that's why the department had voted against her tenure and so on. And how much of the—you know, it amounted to did so-and-so say this at such-and-such a time? And I don't know how you ever prove who says what at which times.

But anyway, finally it was decided to settle it out of court, and to settle it by (this may have been Catherine's proposal, I don't know)—to settle it by having a group of unbiased people from outside the University and somebody on the staff hear the case and decide whether she should have tenure or not. And [chuckling] so that was done: one was, I think, somebody approved by Catherine; somebody else selected by the department; I think Joe Crowley was the University's representative on the hearing committee.

The committee came to town and interviewed members of the music department and so on, and what happened is that the staff in music, all of whom had voted against Catherine's tenure and had been violent at opposing tenure—Roscoe Booth wouldn't have her in the same room, and Puffer, I guess, was out of town, maybe not, I don't know. But anyway, all the music department people came in and said, "Oh, no, no, no. We wouldn't do anything like that. She's a wonderful person—" And so (I talked only to Joe about this), and Joe, who knew that she should not have tenure because she didn't have the background, Joe and the others were constrained to vote yes because on the

basis of this one testimony [laughing] of the music department, they just turned it around completely. And so Catherine was given her tenure.

And I guess I would cite that as an example of the Affirmative Action working in the wrong way, to give somebody advantages because of sex that the person should not have. And I don't think that worked very often, but it does work in some instances. I think there are more instances in which women, for example, are underpaid than in which they are overpaid, because of their sex; I think there's no doubt about that. But there also are instances in which women have used their sex as a way of getting, I think, special consideration. And you can't do it that way. And those, I think, are weaknesses in the whole scheme of Affirmative Action, but I think not serious enough to detract from the advantages of the whole thing.

The Affirmative Action, of course, is also expensive. It costs us—I don't know how you can estimate it—it certainly costs us one full-time position, and it also certainly costs something in the expense of application review and that kind of thing—recruiting. And it may even lose us some good candidates because of the delays involved and so on. But on the whole, I think it's worth it, at least for the present time. And until attitudes change more thoroughly, I think maybe it's a necessary kind of safeguard to have.

I object to certain things about it. I object to the alleged quota system, which the Affirmative Action people insist is not a quota system, but is a series of hiring goals. I think it operates in the same way, so that the pressure is to take one candidate in order to meet a hiring goal, rather than one candidate on the basis of his qualifications. And I believe very strongly that whether you have Affirmative Action or not, people should be hired on the basis of

their qualifications and their abilities rather than their racial or religious preferences. And I think sometimes the installation of the hiring goals can pressure departments or people to hire people they shouldn't hire, and worse than that, sometimes to hire them at ranks or salaries that are disproportionate to those of other candidates.

During the sixties, for example, the black candidates were very difficult to find—qualified black candidates. And there was a tendency all over the country to hire black staff members at salaries and ranks that were disproportionate to the rest of the faculty. Well, this was fine for about four or five years, and all the faculty thought this was wonderful. "We are meeting Affirmative Action goals." And then after five years, they started observing the qualifications of their colleague who was making more money than they were and was less qualified; and you start getting the opposite reaction and a lot of complaints about it. And that happened fairly frequently all over. But it was again not as important as the whole operation. So it did it, too— worked here.

Would you like to say anything about the quality of faculty over the years?

I did, oh, two or three weeks ago, talk to the University Club on the subject of—well, it was allegedly a kind of series of reminiscences, but the theme I had was that the University, in particular the faculty, had been improving steadily over all the years I've been here, and I think this a legitimate kind of thesis. And on the whole, I think the faculty at Nevada is a remarkably good—remarkably well-qualified faculty, much better than one might expect at an institution of this size and this remoteness and so on. And there are various reasons for it. One of them, there has for some time now

been a fairly strict requirement that nobody be hired without an appropriate terminal degree. And the faculty has been small enough that this has been pretty much followed, so that in Arts and Science there are practically no faculty members with any kind of permanent positions who don't have a Ph.D. degree. That, of course, is a paper qualification and not an indication of a good faculty member, but it's one kind of guarantee that you don't get totally unqualified people. So that, that has helped.

Another has been the growing and continuing at least insistence on some research or encouragement of some research, and I think that has worked toward the improvement of the faculty, considerably. Plus the fact that, quite apart from any skill in administration, the University happens to be a place where it's fairly pleasant to live, and where it's easy to attract people in spite of the high cost of living; so that we've participated in what years ago academically was called the "California Gold Rush" and have been able to recruit good faculty members from good places.

So that I think on the whole it's a good faculty, and I think the fact that it has a great deal of power in a democratically run system is part of the attraction and part of the basis for the quality of the faculty. It varies, of course, from department to department, but on the whole it's a good faculty, I think, and not, as some legislators are wont to say, a parcel of deadwood. The deadwood is relatively infrequent.

THOUGHTS ON THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY

Thoughts on the role of the University—. I suppose I could speculate about [that] for a long time. Well, this isn't a prepared speech, but let me say just a few things. One of them is that a university is a kind of peculiar, special sort of place. It's not a copy of life; it's a little community; it's an artificial community. And it's good for certain things and not good for other things.

And one, I think, of the problems publicly and also within universities is a kind of increasing faith in the last couple of decades, at least—a kind of increasing faith that a university can do anything and can solve all kinds of problems, which isn't true. It's not the most efficient way to do all kinds of things, and therefore, I think one of the major kinds of things that people in universities and people in lay positions directing universities need to go back and consider from time to time is what can a university do better than anything else? There are dozens of ways of educating people, and a university is one of them. But a university is a kind of unique method or a kind of unique instrument for

education in that what it does is bring together a group of people who allegedly want to learn and a group of people who allegedly are interested in teaching, and put 'em around a library, and hope for results.

And you can get results in certain ways. You can get results out of excursions into what has happened, into the past, and into scientific experiments, and into literature, current and past. And by a discussion, examination of these things you can help people—both those trying to teach and those trying to learn—do more. And you can develop research out of the library and out of scientific things. But you can't, for example, compete with an apprenticeship program in learning the tricks of being a plumber, I should think. I'm not even sure you can compete with a newspaper in learning how to be a journalist. There are certainly certain things you can learn, but I think it's more efficient to learn how to write headlines by working on a newspaper than it is by taking a course in headline writing. How far that extends, it's hard to say, and obviously there are useful things that a university can do.

Anyway, I think one should not lose sight of the fact that a university is perhaps at its very best in producing a kind of liberal education, that as it becomes what James Bryant Conant called a “multiversity,” it does combine various sorts of professional training, but the value of having this professional training connected with a university is largely that it makes it convenient for the people learning the profession or getting a start in the profession—it makes it convenient for them also to get a basic liberal education. So that the two do work and do fit together.

The understanding, this kind of thing, is one of the real problems, I suppose, in the relationships between a university and a community, because the community supports the university and supports it more or less adequately, but supports it largely on the assumption that the university is providing some service that the community needs. And the difficulties that often occur there are that the university and the community have totally different notions of what the community needs. And you get into an awkward sort of situation, in which the community sometimes with a good deal of enthusiasm supports the university, let’s say, because it assumes that it’s necessary to have a university for any person who wants to get a job in our society, or because it’s sure that the university’s going to make Willie and Johnny earn more money, so they can support their parents in their old age, something of that sort.

Well, it usually doesn’t work out just that way, and it’s quite possible that, I think, maybe the students who took my classes at least were likely to come out of it making less money than they would have made if they never had! That may not be true. But the university’s major function, I think, is not to make people make more money, even though the community may think so. And

the university is partly, then, pressured to perpetuate that myth itself, in order to keep its funding up, so that you get a kind of awkward circular arrangement. The fact, of course, is—or the ideal is that the (well, maybe it’s a fact, too) that the university has some obligation to educate the community in what it ought to need, and the community, if it is smart, will delegate to the university not just the function of doing what the community thinks it ought to do, but also the function of telling the community what it ought to want, which is a little awkward. I’ve frequently used the analogy of a patient and a doctor: that you don’t go to a surgeon and get diagnosed and then tell the surgeon how to hold the knife and where to cut; you delegate to the surgeon the duty or the responsibility of both diagnosing what you need and curing what you have. And in a way, the relation of community and an educational institution is the same: you presumably hire alleged experts in education to teach not only your students but the adults in the community, and if this assumption is right and you do get experts, then it would seem a waste of money not to give them some authority and responsibility to go ahead and do what they think ought to be done. And if all they need to do is follow the specific directions of the lay group in the community, then you don’t need to hire people with degrees who command at least slightly more money than the garbage collectors. And so you could do it more cheaply if you didn’t expect that kind of expertise from the people doing it.

Well, that’s all very elaborately philosophical. And more practically, what you get as one of the problems is the kind of thing that was exemplified in some of the talk early in this legislative session [1981], in which you had people in the legislature suggesting—well, one legislator from this community actually suggesting that things

like anthropology and philosophy should be done away with because who gets jobs in anthropology and philosophy? Therefore, you do away with them. I've heard the same thing in past sessions about music and art, that they should not be maintained in the University, and you can cut them—.

The president has a little of the same notion, apparently, in his budget cutting now. I was noticing that the proposal—I guess it was from David Stockman but ultimately must have been approved by Reagan—to cut out some forty-six percent of the funding for the endowment in the arts and humanities. One of the most interesting parallels there is that that cut would be somewhat less than the appropriation for military bands in the defense department, which is an interesting parallel.

But some of that attitude in the legislature is, I suppose, part of a trend, an anti-intellectual trend that exists. But it's also partly a matter of misunderstanding what education is about. The kinds of budget cutting that are there specify a kind of naive, I think, notion of the importance of simply training the mind and giving the mind some background in what's gone on in the world as a preliminary to any kind of occupation, if this occupation is to be more imaginative than putting in an eight-to-five day in order to have time over the weekend to run your camper. And that's the kind of problem there.

There's one other aspect of the legislative attitude that I think is important, and that is the growing tendency in this state, and I suspect in other states—the growing tendency for the legislature, simply by exercising its financial power, to take over from the Board of Regents or whatever other lay group is in charge the functions of policy-making for the institution, or even to take over the function of administering the University,

which is usually delegated by the Board of Regents to an administration. That is, when the legislature actually specifies certain kinds of budget cuts, this becomes, in effect, an actual administrative decision which the legislature can make, I think, inevitably (or the governor's office, which recommends it to the legislature)—the kind of decision that can be made only within adequate evidence most of the time, and certainly the kind of decision that should be left to the administration of the university, if you are hiring the administration because of their alleged knowledge of what ought to be taught. And that becomes a really very serious problem of conflicting authorities, and I think is a problem with this budget, in which the governor's budget has actually—.

Well, to take one specific example, the governor's budget cut out all appropriations for part-time teaching. Well, that's an administrative decision that should be left to the University. And it's an easy thing to slash from a budget, and it's true that probably the governor's office and the legislature are not going to raise serious objections if after the appropriation is made, the University restores some of that funding, taking it from some other place, which it will have to do. The University must have some funding for part-time teaching, particularly a university no larger than this, which can't afford expertise in all aspects of all subjects. So that it becomes very useful for the instruction of the University, for example, to have a local attorney who is willing to donate part of his services for a nominal fee—three hundred dollars a credit or something is paying an attorney at a tenth of his usual salary, I assume. But there are people who are willing to donate that because of their interest in the University. Well, to cut that out would be absurd, and the University cannot afford a

full-time regular staff member to do the kinds of things that an attorney or an architect or some other person may be able to do on a part-time, almost volunteer basis. So that becomes a sort of problem.

There was, of course, years ago a court case, the so-called King case, which was a case essentially, I think, trumped up by the Board of Regents. I can't remember all the circumstances now, but it was a case that was taken to the courts I think by the board, essentially, for the purpose of establishing in the courts the Board of Regents' authority over the University affairs, in opposition to the legislative authority. I should remember more details of that than I do, but it was a case that's frequently still cited whenever a question of who has the final say on some University matter comes up. And it involves the constitutional creation of the Board of Regents and also over the years the decision as to where the control at the University should be. It comes up, too, in connection with the authority of the board over junior colleges, let's say—whether these are part of higher education and therefore must be under the Board of Regents, or whether a separate board could or should be created, and that kind of thing.

But the effect of the King case is to indicate that the board has this authority. Practically, though, the legislature can certainly exert a considerable amount of authority just because the legislature has to appropriate the funding. And University of Nevada, like most state universities, is primarily funded by annual appropriation— or by an appropriation. It doesn't have enough endowment to make much difference. A private university has some advantages in that way if it happens to have the kind of funding that Harvard has. If it doesn't, it's likely to be in more trouble even than the state institutions.

Why does the legislature seem to attack the University every two years?

Well, that's an interesting kind of question, and I can only speculate, but I think there are a couple of plausible enough reasons. One of them—there are more than a couple—one reason for the attacks on the University is that—and this is one of the most crass reasons—is that the legislator, who is after all thinking from time to time, at least, about running for his term in office— almost always there are things that can be said critically about a university or about any educational institution, which will attract a good deal of public support. That is, it's almost always popular if you can find some relatively sensational thing to say about a subject like education. And people generally are enough interested and enough self-appointed authorities on education that they're likely to get involved. So that if you say that— and this is one of the standards—if you say, "Here is so-and-so who teaches only nine hours a week. What does he mean taking taxpayers' high salaries in order to loaf around like that?" If you say that, this sounds as if the legislator is protecting the interests of the taxpayer, as if he's really concerned about the welfare of students, and really wanting taxpayers to get their money's worth for what's going on, plus the fact that there always are one or two people in the experience of the public or the legislature who can confirm this. That is, there are obviously some teachers who teach nine hours a week and spread manure on their lawns the rest of the time, and that's the end of it. But this is a very small minority on which to generalize.

Not only is this politically attractive for the legislator, but there also are legislators who really believe this kind of thing, and particularly some who are probably motivated

by particular experiences they have had., One of the particular difficulties of a small state is that most of the legislators are graduates of the University. In fact, Mary this summer during the campaign was convinced that every person in the state was someone who'd had freshman English from me at one time or another and had received a low grade. [Laughs] We kept running into people who would remind me that they got a C from me in freshman English, and Mary was never sure how they were going to vote as a result [laughing]! But there is that difficulty, and I think some of the talk in this legislature came from that. Steve Coulter's attack on research seems to me—whether he was aware of it or not—I think that it can't be separated from the fact that Steve was unhappy about not getting an appointment in journalism and that one of the reasons he did not get the appointment in journalism was that he had no research record. And therefore, he was, I think, especially prone to make exaggerated comments about the University's emphasis on research, which, goodness knows, is not a great enough emphasis to show any imbalance at this stage; if there's imbalance, it's still on the other side.

Or other firm beliefs—I remember a couple of years ago what a long conversation that President Crowley and I had with Cliff McCorkle and I think Tom ["Spike"] Wilson. And both of them are essentially sympathetic with the University, I think, but McCorkle, particularly, was absolutely convinced that most of the people on the campus loafed around ninety percent of the time, that this was a kind of "soft" job, and that people could obviously be teaching more than they were, that the teaching loads were too small. And you use the kind of standard argument which I've always used with attorneys who say that, which is—"How many hours did you spend in court this week?"

And the answer to that, of course, is, "Well, that's different." And it is different, but [chuckles] not totally different. And so it isn't there.

Or another example—a man named Johns, and this is not a legislator but a—I can't think of his first name— Al Johns, I believe. He's retired from University of Nevada, Las Vegas, where he was in political science, I think. He was a journalist before that. But he had, as I recall, rather a bad experience at UNLV. And I don't know whether he retired under pressure or not; the story is that he did. But anyway, the last couple of weeks—he's now writing a column for the Valley Times, and the last couple of weeks he has been making simply atrocious and irresponsible charges against the UNLV faculty as a bunch of bums who loaf around all the time. The last column, for example, that I noticed, was simply an observation that there had been a faculty work-load study in which the average faculty work load was listed as fifty-five hours a week. And he—without any facts or any information—just labels this one of the great lies of all time; and all faculty members must be liars if this is true, because he knows better. He has no information at all, but he goes on with a full paragraph of this kind of vituperation, which sounds as if it comes out of bitterness rather than anything else.

Well, that's one reason—one further reason for getting that from the legislature. Another one is that— and this is perhaps basic—that the legislature is faced, in connection with the University, as well as with every other institution—the legislature is faced with the problem of how to make a limited income stretch over a variety of demands from all sorts of institutions in the state. And it's hard to make those priority decisions.

You know, I think, for example, that I can argue that if you have a better educational

institution, you have less need for funding for various kinds of penal institutions. That is, I can argue theoretically that cutting back on the University's budget in order to provide better prisons is going at it in the wrong direction, and that a cut in educational budgets ultimately results in an increased demand for a prison budget. Well, I think that's maybe logical, and I think probably legislators—. a lot of them would agree with that in a theoretical sense. But at the same time, you've got a prison that has more inmates than can be taken care of in the space that's there, so the immediate demand is to provide more funding for the prison, and so that immediate demand has to be met. A university budget up to a point provides that same kind of immediate demand; you have to do it. But the kinds of funding for the kinds of things that one has to look at with more imagination—it is difficult to justify when you've got the immediate practical demands of some other group pushing, plus the fact that legislation is now influenced tremendously by very successful and very skillful lobbying enterprises.

And the University is not as skillful in lobbying as some other institutions, and not only that, the University is in a position in which it's probably impossible for it to put on lobbying pressures of the same kind that you get from other groups. It's ironic and perhaps paradoxical, but for the University to send down a delegation of—what was it?—oh, it was yesterday, wasn't it, that there was a—not a demonstration, but a lot of people simply appeared to support Sue Wagner's bill on I think compensation for abused wives, or something of the sort—a perfectly good bill and one that needs support. But it's accepted by the state and the legislature that there would be pressure from various groups for that kind of bill. But if a bunch of people go

down to support the University, almost every time you get a backlash reaction. Almost every time—"Why aren't these people in class teaching their students? Why—why—?" We don't need this kind of pressure, so it's hard to match the lobbying there.

Well, anyway, after all that, the relevant thing is that the legislature inevitably, in order to justify what it's doing, has to be looking for ways to economize. It's in a way their function. And one way to look for ways to economize is to look for abuses, to look for things that are wrong. Then you look at the University, you look at whatever is vulnerable, and then you attack that. And there are certain things that are vulnerable. A couple of years ago the first attack was a different kind of vulnerability. The University simply had done a bad job in the chancellor's office of preparing the budget in the forms which the legislature had required. And that was simply muddling in the chancellor's office, changing the format of the budget from the one that was submitted by UNR at least (and I don't know about UNLV), but changing it to a form that wasn't, satisfactory for the legislature. Well, that was the first thing that was jumped on. If you remember, Baeppler was practically thrown out of the Ways and Means Committee meeting on the grounds that they didn't know how to prepare a budget.

You know—well, it wasn't really all that important, but it was a way of justifying the legislature's position in trying to produce some cuts in the budget. The same kind of thing is true of attacks this year. If you've got philosophy and anthropology in the budget and these are not necessary, then obviously what you do is point out the way the University is wasting the taxpayers money on anthropology and philosophy, and you can cut the budget that way. And so it becomes a rationalization for what the legislature

really has to try to do, which is make the expenditures roughly come out equal to the income, and that's not an easy job, even though in this state there's been a longtime tradition of underestimating the income and producing a considerable surplus. Even that may be no longer the state of affairs if there are other kinds of tax cuts that are being anticipated. And that's going to continue to cause trouble.

You have mentioned some other things on your outline here which are obviously important. I think the kinds of things that I've been saying about the role of the University do—in a way are the same kinds of things one would say in connection with what the University should be doing for the students, although there is a slightly different application there. That is, you've got again, as you so often have in any university, this kind of divided responsibility and the need for joint action.

The pressure during the sixties, for example, which was never very great in Nevada, but which nationally had a lot of influence for the student—the student influence on what was taught and how it was taught and so on—that whole movement had some reason for existence because of the tendency, at least, in some places and with some people, the tendency to proceed without any interest in the students at all. And all the talk about relevance did have, I think, some value. Also I think the pressures for student participation in policy-making were useful pressures. And in a way there was a kind of real revolution, I think, at least in some places, in the philosophy of administration and education because—.

Well, when I was in school, for example, I think one never thought of questioning whether what you were doing was what you ought to be doing or not; this is what you did. And I don't think it ever occurred to me

or to any of my classmates, for that matter, ever to question what was going on. Oh, we might gripe, and there were always certain kinds of general objections: that is, why did I have to have Latin for a Ph.D. in English, for example? And I remember questioning that, but it never occurred to me to question it on the basis of its being wrong; it was just that it seemed a nuisance to have to take that extra Latin course.

Well, in the sixties students did question not only whether you need Latin, but whether you need German and French, or whether you could do it with one language for the Ph.D. And for a variety of reasons, the language requirements were relaxed, which may have been good, but the student pressure was there. undergraduate pressure was the same kind of thing, and I didn't when I was in school ever feel that the requirements I was given were unreasonable requirements. They may have been, but it didn't occur to me to question them.

Well, the questioning in the sixties was, I think, sound, and it forced universities to think a little more about whether what had been going on for generations and generations was what really was needed in education, because a lot of what was happening was simply repetition of traditions. You had certain requirements just because they'd always been there, I think.

Now I think also that the tendency to do away with all requirements was probably equally mistaken and that a current tendency to reintroduce some requirements is probably healthy. But what really has come about, I should say, is a kind of more cooperative attitude, in which the needs of the students or the assumed needs of the students are given at least more consideration.

I don't believe that ultimately the student is the best person to decide on what his

education should be, for the same reason that I think the community should not decide. That is, if the person who is hired as an educator is going to live up to his billing, then he ought to be better qualified to tell the student what he needs than the student himself.

On the other hand, that doesn't go so far as suggesting that the student's own interests shouldn't be taken into account or the student's particular abilities or lack of abilities shouldn't be taken into account, or that the student's understanding or lack of understanding shouldn't be taken into account.

That is, one of the tendencies during the sixties (and perhaps a little earlier, too) that was a change from my day was that you actually criticized the teaching and thought there ought to be something done about it. Now, it's true enough that we criticized our teachers, and some of them were not very good. And we made distinctions among the teachers, and some were more popular than others, but it didn't occur to us that we should change that. That's sort of what you expected—you expected some bad teachers, and you compensated for that by other good ones, or you compensated for that by having to work harder in the class; and actually I guess I learned more from some very bad teachers than others because you learn in spite of yourself.

But in the sixties, where you started getting student evaluation of teaching and actually the kind of blackmail that goes on when you put out books on various teachers and various courses, and indicate the percentage of A's and B's and C's and F's in those classes—when you start getting that kind of thing, you have a different sort of criticism of the teaching. Again, there's a certain amount of healthiness in this, as well as a certain amount of real danger. The

healthy thing is that it does force teachers to start remembering that what they're supposed to do is convey some knowledge and some skill and some ability to a class of students. And if nothing is happening, then regardless of how learned that the teacher is, he's not doing his job.

On the other hand, this kind of pressure and criticism has at least two real disadvantages. One of them is that it puts pressure on the teacher to teach in such a way that he becomes popular, and any unscrupulous teacher can do that pretty easily. The most obvious thing he does is give everybody A's. But quite apart from anything as obvious as that, there are ways to become popular without being a good teacher, and that is encouraged by this kind of system. The other one is that it encourages the attitude in students that they have no obligation and no responsibility, that what they come to college for is to sit back and have knowledge pushed into them; and if that isn't occurring, it's somebody else's fault. And that is a mistaken notion of the teacher-student relationship: one learns; he is not taught.

And it's a mistake for a student to assume that all he has to do is sit back and let the pleasant waters of learning pour over him, and something will happen; it doesn't work in that way. He learns only when he makes some kind of effort to learn. And the fact that a teacher may be dull is not really an excuse for not learning anything. It's sometimes possible to learn a good deal more from a dull teacher than from a witty teacher, say, or one who is more interesting or more amusing. And you can even make an argument, if you want to take it to the extreme, that the teacher in some ways is the least important part of the whole learning process—that the student and the students working together and the library and the materials are the two most important parts of the machinery. I think— maybe

it's—is it Newman, in his *Idea of a University*, who suggests that the first thing you have to have for a university is a library, then you have to have students, and the third thing is the faculty. And I think in a way that's right, that a group of students with some books can learn, and that the faculty helps, but it isn't absolutely essential to have the faculty there.

So what's been happening to education, I think, has been very valuable, very useful in throwing emphasis on the obligation of the teacher to teach, to think about the students' needs. And that becomes doubly important as the population of universities increases—that is, as the percentage of the population attending universities increases. And I think in the sixties partly what happened was a kind of sudden realization that the situation that had existed for many, many years, in which you had a kind of intellectually elite group as the only attendants in a university, so that there wasn't any real pressure to cater for their particular difficulties, their particular weaknesses; they were capable on the whole—the students were—were capable of learning for themselves.

I'm generalizing very broadly now, but in general you had a group of students who were selected and who were academically likely to be better equipped than the average. Now that started changing much, much earlier than the 1960s. Oh, when I was in school, there were many students who weren't really interested in a university, who were there for the same irrelevant reasons that appear now. They were there to do what their parents wanted them to do, or they were there because they didn't have anything else to do, or they were there because they wanted to find a husband, or they were there to play football—all maybe fairly good reasons, but that wasn't totally recognized. Plus the fact there were a lot of them there who thought they wanted a

university education but were not really much interested in it, particularly not interested in the kinds of, oh, purely academic disciplines that operated in so much of it.

That is, they might be there just because they thought they ought to go to a university, but a lot of them were there because they wanted some specific kind of goal, particularly getting a job or something of that sort, so that they were impatient with—well, would have to take a foreign language, is perhaps the best example. And as you know, during the sixties, the foreign language requirement was dropped in many institutions, being rather slowly and fairly frequently reinstituted in a lot of places, although not to the extent it had been there traditionally. And you can argue both ways: it's true that in many of the institutions, when the foreign language requirement was dropped, after a few years, enrollments in foreign languages increased, when it was on a voluntary basis—so that it may be that the requirement was not a good idea, totally.

But that kind of difference did exist in the attitude of students and the attitude of faculty. And the question of whether foreign languages was relevant or not was a very difficult question to argue about, partly because it's, you know relevant to what? And relevant became a kind of fad word, which I guess has almost disappeared from educational talk; I don't hear much about relevance any more. But it was the buzz word of the 1960s and '50s. And it did become just a kind of general term, but lost pretty much its meaning. It was just—anything relevant was good, and irrelevant was bad, but nobody was quite sure what relevant and irrelevant meant. And the result was, I suppose, a kind of swing that is now being countered with a sort of swing back toward more conservative, if you like, or more traditional attitudes toward education.

The current talk, for example—well, no, it isn't current; it's almost disappearing—but the reaction a few years ago, just a relatively few years ago, was all the talk of “back to basics.” And that still exists a little. And the problem there was that basics had no more specific reference than relevance did, in the sixties. And when you tried getting some indication of what the people shouting most loudly for return to basics really meant, what they meant was not what I would consider “basic” at all.

For example—this just occurs to me—I'd be willing to bet that the lady in the legislature who said, “Let's get rid of anthropology and philosophy”—I think that's what she wanted to get rid of, was anthropology and something else, maybe—I think it was philosophy—but anyway, I'd be willing to bet that she also would be all in favor of getting back to basics, that she would think that's what she was doing, in a way. And the difference is that I would consider philosophy at least as the basic, almost, and anthropology as pretty basic also. But she would be thinking in basics—as basic, maybe doing enough arithmetic to be able to balance a checkbook, something of that sort. Or almost always the people—and one of the places in which the talk about back to basics has been most prevalent is in connection with English, particularly English composition. And there, when you pin down the people who were shouting about back to basics, they really are talking about, oh, minor questions of orthography, for example, like spelling and punctuation, rather than basic matters of expressing oneself in the language.

So when they talk about “back to basics,” they don't really mean basics at all; they mean back to superficialities, frequently, but the superficialities that show and that anyone without any knowledge of what basics really are can criticize. The people who criticize the teaching of writing most vigorously are

likely to be the people who have just enough knowledge to be able to spell a little but who maybe can't write at all. But they're the ones, if you write an application letter with a misspelled word, who crawl all over it. Or even worse are those who happen to have learned sometime what a split infinitive is, and who have a notion that this is bad. And they may not know anything else about the language, but if they can identify a split infinitive, that really is great sport, and you can jump all over it. But it's not really back to basics, I think, to worry about split infinitives.

Well, I don't know that I—you've got some fascinating topics here* that would be fun to talk about, I suppose, except I don't know what to say—. The characteristics of a good teacher, for example—that's very, very hard to say, partly because it depends so much on whom he's teaching. For example, some of the teachers I remember as the teachers who influenced me most are totally different.

The man who directed my dissertation, Robert Cecil Bald, who's dead now, but Bald was an Englishman—he was an Australian, I guess—who had been educated in Cambridge.

He was very knowledgeable, very learned, an extensive, successful research person. He came to Cornell just about the time I started my graduate study, and was brought in because of his scholarship. I admired him tremendously and still do. And at the same time and as a teacher in the undergraduate classes I sat through, he was really quite dull. He spoke sort of in a monotone—always thinking, and I thought it was great teaching, that his major qualification was that he knew so much and was so smart, and it came out. Plus the fact that as a human being—and this, I suppose, the ordinary undergraduate in a

*On prepared outline

lecture would not have been aware of—as a human being, he was very kind and very thoughtful. And as a graduate student, I had an hour with him every week if I had anything to say. And part of what I did was spend my time trying to think up questions to ask him which might help me learn something, and he was very good about answering them. So that he was in many ways the teacher who influenced me most all the time I was in school. And he was not at all what you would consider a brilliant teacher.

Another man who also influenced me very strongly was William Clyde DeVane, who's also dead. And he was chairman of the English department at Cornell and then left—he left before I finished to become dean of Yale College, and he died as dean of the college at Yale not so many years ago. In fact, ironically, he did an article for a book I was editing just before he died. But DeVane, on the other hand, was a very brilliant, clever—a clever lecturer. And he came to Cornell—got to Cornell the same time I did as an undergraduate, and I got into one of his courses in seventeenth-century literature. And there were about fifteen students in the class, and it was a highly successful class. But by the end of the semester, he had visitors coming in so that the class was about doubled in size. And he repeated it the next—no, the next semester he did a course in Milton, and the course in Milton had a hundred and twenty students registered in it, which is not standard procedure for Milton. So that he was a very, very popular lecturer in the classes and totally different from the other man I admired.

And I suppose the two things that they had in common were—and that maybe are necessary for a good teacher—the two things they had in common were knowing their business, that is, knowing what they were

talking about, being competent scholars in their field so that they got the respect of the student because of their knowledge, which is the first thing that you have to have. And the second thing is that they were the kinds of human beings who were interested in other people and in the students, and this came out. And maybe those are the two essential things. I think both of those were infinitely more important than having instruction in the devices and methods of pedagogy.

That is, I think there is obviously a certain amount of value in knowing the most efficient ways to pass out papers and in having command of certain dodges and kinds of skills that will get the attention of the student; I think these can be valuable, and particularly for a teacher who lacks confidence, knowing how to make up a lesson plan can be very, very good. But I think no amount of skill in pedagogy in the long run can produce a really good teacher. It can make a bad teacher better, or it can make a mediocre teacher slightly better. But I think for a good teacher, you have to have this knowledge and enthusiasm for the subject because that's the only way in the long run you can get the students' respect and lasting interest. And then you have to have the willingness and the desire to try to do it.

And if you have those two things, the mannerisms don't get in the way—you know, you get told in courses in pedagogy that you must avoid doing distracting things: flipping your eyeglasses around or pacing up and down the room; you must get eye contact with you class. Well, I just the other day, speaking of eye contact, Mary was working on her—she's working on her master's degree in political theory, and I remembered that I had done some outlines as an undergraduate in a philosophy course on Plato's political theory, and I thought it might be fun to dig 'em out and see what they were like 'cause I

couldn't remember. Well, I realized, when I got it out, I had a sheaf of notes that thick [a couple of inches] on a course that I had taken in philosophy as an undergraduate. And I remembered that what I had done was go to the class and take the lectures pretty much in shorthand and then go home and type them up, which was a very good device, not so much because I had the lectures, but because I then forced myself to review what was there. (It was a bad scheme in many ways because I was more concerned about taking them down than listening to them a lot of the time.) But the point is that I remember this was a man named Cunningham who taught that course and was not a brilliant research philosopher, although he had done two or three books in philosophy. But he taught the whole course looking out the window! He never looked at the class! He paced around the room looking out the window with his hands over his head, and still he was really a brilliant lecturer in an undergraduate course. He had things worked out in great detail; his mind was logical, and you could just see it operating as he did it. And he was a great teacher, I think, in many ways. And it was partly a matter not only of knowing what his subject matter was, but trying to put it in order, trying to get it conveyed to a class.

I remember other teachers whom I liked and admired. Oh, I had one graduate course, I remember, which was nothing but sitting for two hours in the afternoon while the professor read the citations from his bibliography on sixteenth century literature and made comments about what those books contained. And we took down the notes. Well, actually that's a kind of useful bibliography, which I still have [laughing], but he could have mimeographed the thing. But again, I don't particularly regret having done that exercise, but it was not brilliant teaching. But again, this was a man who knew what he was talking

about, and you admired him simply because of that, in spite of the fact that the lectures were not anything worth doing.

One of the most popular lecturers at Cornell while I was there was Carl Becker, the historian, who was internationally known. And Becker's classes were packed always, because everybody was supposed to go hear the great man. And Becker, by that time, was not in terribly good health, and you couldn't hear a word if you sat back of the third row. And he would have a hundred and twenty students in that class, ninety of whom didn't hear anything during the lectures! And at the same time, if you sat in the front row—I never took a class from Becker, but I used to go to a lecture once in a while, and if you sat up front, it was again not brilliant or exciting or flashy, but just terribly sound and revealing when you were there where you could hear it.

In other words, what I'm saying is I don't know what a good teacher is or what the characteristics are that—that somehow it comes out. And of course, again it does depend, really, greatly on the student. Here, of course, in administration I get constantly conflicting reports on who are the good teachers and who are not the good teachers. And if you read through a set of student evaluations, you end up in utter confusion, frequently, because the students tend to have sometimes totally directly conflicting opinions of whether this or that person is a good teacher or why he's a good teacher. And I guess it's really very hard to say.

The annual alumni award to the best teacher is a hard thing to analyze. I don't know—certainly my personal guess is that about half the time I suspect that the best teacher is really a very good teacher indeed, but about half the time the teacher is a real phony—that is, it's someone who has by artificial means attracted a lot of not very

discerning students to feel that he's the—or she is a really great teacher. I'm trying to think back over the winners of that award in the last ten years, and I think maybe my guess is right, that I think about half of them were pretty good, and the other half not. But of course, I have no—I'm not really in any position to judge.

One of the real difficulties in any kind of evaluation of faculty is the attempt to evaluate teaching qualities of the faculty. We try to do this, but it's very hard to do. And one of the problems in evaluation of faculty—one of the problems is that evaluation of teaching is so very difficult, and tends to be so noncommittal, that decisions on questions like merit, anything that becomes a kind of decision on comparing one faculty member with another, ultimately, in trying to select those who are better than others—those decisions tend to be forced into questions of research productivity or outside service rather than teaching, because almost everyone comes in evaluated by his department as either excellent or most excellent, regardless of what the person's teaching abilities are. It's so very hard to evaluate them and so difficult to get evidence, that almost always the department chairman starts out by saying so-and-so is an excellent teacher or a very good teacher or—and usually he can produce student evaluations which support that view, or if not, he can rationalize 'em away.

So that the result is that the—and this is one of the reasons, I suppose, going way, way back to what we were saying—that somebody like Steve Coulter will say there's an undue emphasis on research in the University. There is, perhaps, in the sense that in practice, committees tend to make their personnel decisions very heavily on the basis of research because that's the only tangible thing they've got to deal with. And I don't know quite what

to do about that because it's—I believe very strongly in the value of subjective personal judgments from people who are good subjective judges, but it's very hard for them to get the kind of information they need to have an opinion.

A department chairman who's good probably has a pretty good feel for whether this person is a good or bad teacher, or a good or bad scholar. But a dean can't know enough about all the people to have that feeling, and certainly the vice president can't, so you're back to accepting that feeling from the department chairman, but the department chairman may not be a very good judge, so you've got difficulties there. Or the department chairman may, as he frequently does because we've got a hierarchical system—the temptation is for the department chairman to get off the hook very early just by recommending everybody, and that's a kind of not unusual procedure. And it's the result of having the other stages in judgment which he can rationalize out of—that makes him popular with his department. Deans can do the same thing. It leaves it up to committees at different levels.

I've said various things, I'm sure, about curriculum and courses, and academic standards, as well. I might make just one comment on academic standards, and that is that one of the kinds of errors that we make frequently both in our public image and in our actual thinking is the equation of academic standards with grades. That is, frequently, there is the assumption that when we say the University has—the academic standards have dropped, that all that means is that it's now much easier to get an A than it was earlier. Now this is all very true, and I think it does constitute a kind of drop in academic standards on one level—the inflation of the grading system, so that, oh, thirty years ago, a C was a grade which is now defined as it

was then in the catalog as the grade that the average student will receive, and obviously if only ten percent of the students receive the average grade, it isn't very accurately defined as an average grade, so that the grading system is deflated.

But academic standards involve a great deal more than just the grades in a course. And academic standards involve all sorts of things: what the instructor requires, what the level of the instruction may be, what the student is required to know at the end, whether there are examinations or not, whether there are papers required, whether it's false and true only, whether a certain kind of mental discipline is required to get through the class—all of those things are involved in academic standards and are much more important than what the grade is. The grade may, of course, reflect that, and in a sense the notion is that because of the grade inflation, less is required of students in order to get through the class. And that may, of course, be true, but it isn't necessarily true. That is, it may be that even though the grades are there, that the class is requiring just as much evidence of intellectual accomplishment from the student as the one in which the grading is different.

But I guess I think on all these accounts, academic standards have decreased over the past few years. I think there's not much—well, past twenty years, let's say—I think there's not much doubt about that, that in some lower division disciplines, at least, we require or expect less of a student who's going to graduate from the University than we did twenty years ago. On the other hand, I suspect that in some disciplines, particularly in the sciences, in that sense, academic standards are higher, and we're expecting more from the student who graduates than we did twenty years ago (maybe not). And it may be true in

more disciplines than the sciences; it's hard to guess about, but it's there.

What about this question of athletes and athletics in the University?

Yeah, well, that's—I like athletics, and I like sports, and I guess for that reason I see no connection between intercollegiate athletics and universities, as intercollegiate athletics are now operating. I think athletics are fun and ought to be fun, that are good recreation. I still play tennis fairly regularly, when I can get around to it. And I don't see really much connection with that kind of activity, and intercollegiate football and basketball, particularly, which are either professional sports in the places like Notre Dame or Ohio State or USC, which can make them professional sports, which have the financing and the attendance possibilities to do it; or there are places which are attempting to become professional sports, like Nevada, which doesn't really have the attendance potential to become big-time financial athletics, but which is attempting to do it.

And the ambition of the participants in the athletic programs is primarily to get a professional contract, and the attendance in the university is incidental and frequently not very consistent, and it just seems to be a kind of curious, accidental development that the connection should be there. And it would probably be much better to have the farm teams for the pros separate from the universities. And the universities in a way are being exploited by having the athletic teams—being exploited by running these farm teams for professional leagues in the universities.

There are exceptions, obviously; you get some students who like intercollegiate athletics and who do participate. I don't

believe for a minute that playing professional college football is a major way of developing character. And I don't think that it's an important adjunct to an education most of the time. There have been good students who have been good athletes, and there will continue to be those. But those could exist without the elaborate machinery that we've built up to produce winning teams and develop the kind of competition, enthusiasm that alumni and others would like to see.

Also it's tended to develop in such a way that one or two major commercialized sports overwhelm all the rest of the athletic program. UNLV, for example, has just cut out track—men's track—and women's volleyball, and women's something else, I notice—eliminated them entirely, as economy measures, because the football program got out of hand; it got into debt. And it's true almost everywhere that the minor sports tend to get less attention, particularly women's sports, than the men's. The result is that it seems to me some of these sports actually serve the purpose of recreation for students just because they do get overwhelmed by the big football and basketball programs, and so that the women's sports and some of the minor sports may remain as kind of games and fun for the people doing them rather than preparations for occupation, but that's a kind of ironic development that I don't think [chuckling] necessarily is sound!

Well, Maynard Hutchins eliminated football from the University of Chicago—gosh, that was in the thirties, wasn't it? And I think it's never been restored. I guess they may have a small basketball program at Chicago now, but I'm not sure. But that was a tremendous step because Chicago had had some of the—Walter [H.] Eckersall was one of the great all-time running backs from Chicago or something, and there was a

tremendous outcry, but it didn't seem to hurt the university greatly when he cut it out.

But no, I think that's potentially a real difficulty for the university education as it develops, and I don't really know quite where it can go because the commercialization is getting greater all the time, and the number of scandals of different sorts that are developing is, I think, increasing slightly and probably will continue to increase. But it seems to me just a strangely irrelevant part of the college education that happens to be there. Even though it's interesting and fun, in a way, it would seem to me much more appropriately a private enterprise activity outside the scope of the university, and night work better if the students weren't bothered by having to go to class occasionally—might be much better football players.

Research—I don't know whether I've said anything—I think I've said a number of things about research. One thing I may not have said, that research is constantly attacked by legislators, and I think I mentioned at an earlier stage that one of the most obvious indications of growth in the University over the years since I first came here is a shifting attitude toward research in the University. The first or second year I was here I remember there was a great furor in the legislature over an article published by a biologist, [E. W.] Ed Lowrance on the bone structures of the muskrat. And there was much, much levity in the legislature about this person who got interested in the bone structure of a muskrat. What in the world did anybody care about muskrats for? The fur wasn't bad, but they weren't good to eat. And he was in some trouble. And it's interesting, as I recall, that the president of the University shared some of this questioning about whether he should be spending his time on the bone structure of the muskrat.

Well, that was singled out partly because there was really not much other writing going on at the time. And I think I mentioned in connection with the Stout affair that one of the criticisms that President Stout made of both me and Chariton Laird was that we were writing books and that that was a basis of some criticism from our fellow faculty members and from the community, that we ought to think a little about spending our time that way. So that there was really a kind of total misunderstanding of the value of research at that time. Now it's true that some practical research was going on through the Agriculture college— federal research programs, but this was accepted because it was mostly looked on as having immediate effect on the quality of rangelands or the quality of the sheep. And also it was federal money, which made it less distressing.

Over the years, there has been a lot of talk about research and a considerable shift in the attitude of the University. It is now true that some kind of scholarly activity is required, I think, for tenure and for any kind of promotion in the faculty, and that that fact is pretty much accepted by the faculty. And that's a total—that's a total shift in emphasis. That does not mean that the University is overemphasizing research; there is still relatively little research going on here as compared with the University of California or Princeton or Yale or Harvard. But there's greatly more than before, and I think it's one of the major indications that the University has sort of matured into a university rather than a kind of overgrown junior college, which maybe it was thirty-five or forty years ago.

The basis for research, I feel, is—and the reason for having it in a university, where I think it belongs, as I don't think football belongs—the reason for having research there

is that I think it's a necessary adjunct to the good teacher. The teachers I was talking about as respecting, I think I respected in a large part because they were people with minds that were obviously alert, that were doing something, that were active beyond simply conveying what they knew to the classes. That is, they were minds that were always adding something to what they had to convey to the classes, rather than minds simply operating in the past. And that was, I think, a necessary adjunct to their qualities as teachers.

So that I think one of the first reasons, maybe the basic reason, for having research in a university is because it's an essential part of the whole university process, and because the good teacher is one who has his mind alive, and if his mind is sufficiently alive, the chances are very good that that's reflected in research or study or reflection and ultimately publication. Now, there are exceptions, obviously; there are good and great teachers who keep their minds alert in other ways, who read constantly and digest what they read—and that's an exception. But in general, the good teacher is the one whose mind is just active enough that it produces something by way of new knowledge all the time.

And then, of course, the other reason is that the research is valuable in itself, and going at it from the other direction, the university is the most likely place in which that research can be found. Now there are other possibilities: drug companies or IBM or other places have research departments that can make progress in technology and that can provide laboratories and the rest, and maybe do better than a university in some ways. But in general, a university is a logical place to have the facilities for research, not only in equipment but in personnel, so that the research can be produced. And when the government needs some kind of

specific research project, it turns, usually, to a university as the most efficient place to get it.

So that from both directions, it seems to me research is an essential of the university experience: one, it's necessary for the development of the faculty in order to produce good teaching; and two, it's the logical place in which to get the highest quality research with the least additional expense. The machinery's already there to produce it. So that I think it's an essential. And obviously, from things I've said, I think that it's, essential that the researcher, that the scholar, that the teacher be free to pursue whatever directions or follow whatever directions he needs to, in order to come to what seemed to him truthful conclusions, and that he has to be protected from the pressures of outside groups—either stupid and foolish ones or even intelligent ones—but he has to be protected from those and has to have academic freedom so that he isn't frightened of what the pressures will be. There are enough pressures to frighten him even without any protection, so that it's just that he have that kind of freedom.

I suppose that this is, perhaps, the only country these days in which one does have—oh, no, not the only one, but it's—there are countries, at least, in which one doesn't have academic freedom. And there are certainly pressures here that hinder academic freedom, and certainly threats these days of more pressures to come, I have a feeling. Some of the proposals for increasing the permission of the FBI and the CIA to investigate individuals are, I think, quite pertinent to questions of academic freedom and are pretty frightening, and suggest going back to the McCarthy days in the fifties. And it may not happen, but there seem to be risks of that. Some of our legislators and executives seem to think that it would be good to do that.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

Oh, I don't know what kinds of summary things ought to be said. I think maybe—I don't know whether I mentioned to you or not, but two or three weeks ago I did end up talking to the University Club, and Rollie Melton made the mistake of suggesting that I do it as a series of reminiscences, which gave me serious problems, as you can observe—I've talked I don't know how many hours of reminiscences here [chuckling]! But as a device for trying to shorten and keep from going on all afternoon, I did at least pretend to a kind of theme, which was that over the last thirty-five years University of Nevada had, in fact, become a kind of university.

And I think I would maintain that thesis and suggest that some of the things I've talked about were important in making that change. For example, even some of the very serious growing pains had that kind of silver lining aspect. And the whole Stout business had the ultimate result of establishing academic freedom as a fairly firm tradition on the campus, and at the same time, sort of ironically, I think, was at the bottom of developing a great deal of faculty participation

in administration, so that Nevada has become much more democratized as a university than most institutions, I think, which has its good and its bad aspects. But almost every candidate for a job in administration who comes out here is a little awed by the extent to which faculty do participate in various kinds of administrative affairs, particularly by the number of committees and the participation in personnel matters and so on. I happen to think that's a good thing, and I think that the kinds of difficulties that grew through the Stout years and the code controversies and so on had a lot to do with developing that and producing a kind of faculty unity.

There's a difference between UNR and UNLV in that regard, in that probably UNLV is pretty near the stage of trying to establish some kind of faculty union. And I think UNR is not at that stage, largely because the kinds of things that a union is important in getting are already things that we have at UNR, at least to a considerable degree. So that I don't expect UNR campus to be unionized in the near future, but might be.

But another way in which those years were (and I mentioned this the other day) leading toward making Nevada closer to a real university was the development of research, which was really just sort of starting in 1945. The attitude then was not only negative as far as the state and the public went, but it was negative within the university in many ways. And there were both administrators and faculty starting to encourage research and reward research, and as a result it started to grow and now has become a respectable part of the whole University—whole University production.

And of course, going along with this was the increase in size, which has been pretty considerable, even though the University is still quite small. The big increase in 1945 to nine hundred students is different from the—is a significant increase.

Well, that was a boom because during the war the University, I gather—I wasn't here, but I gather the enrollments had dropped off to almost nothing, really— five and six hundred students (I'm not certain of the figures there, but they were small) - So that we had a real problem in 1945 in trying to staff courses like freshman English, for instance. There just weren't people to teach it, and nobody expected the big increases. So it was there.

But now, I think the University of Nevada is a good institution and has been developing into one. And part of what's been good about it, too, has been the fact that it has remained relatively small, which has been an advantage not only in teaching, not only because you have smaller classes and no more students and this kind of thing, but also because the kinds of complexities that develop with size just haven't been so important here.

Oh, to take one example, I was thinking as I walked in today, the library is certainly not one of the great university libraries in the

country, even though the collection is greatly increased from the time when I first came here. When I first came here, I remember that I had a letter—I had come here from Indiana where the library, again, was not as (now Indiana library has become one of the very good ones, I think, but at the time it was not a very impressive library). But still I remember [chuckles] that when I came here, I got a letter telling me that as a new faculty member I would have a special allotment to buy books as supplements for my courses, and that I could therefore place orders to get books up to twenty-five dollars worth in order to have a supplement [chuckling] for classes!

The amazing thing, I discovered, though, at that time was that on budgets like that—I remember some woman had— there were strange things had gone on in the library. Some previous librarian, for example, had got the Library of Congress cards sent and hadn't known what they were and then cut them up or cut 'em in two and placed them out as memo pads around for scribbling in the library. Wouldn't buy any new dictionaries because the English language didn't change, and if it did, it shouldn't. And all the periodicals had been stopped just before I came; as an economy measure, the periodical series had about five-year gaps in then just before that time, which, of course, was a very bad economy.

But after this long digression, what I really meant to say was that the smallness and those twenty-five-dollar budgets had really forced people to buy with tremendous care. And I think it's still true that the amount of junk in the library is relatively small. Most libraries, you know, have a high percentage of really pretty useless cataloged material—second and third rate stuff. And I remember noticing when I came here that almost every book in the fields I knew about was a standard edition

or a standard reference text or a standard commentary, that there were very few things that had been bought just because the money was available [chuckling]. And I think that's still characteristic of a small institution: the things that you have tend to be things that are worth having. That isn't totally true; we're getting big enough to have a lot of useless lab equipment around, I suppose, but not very much—relatively.

I had a little quote from the University Times. I believe that was John Roll that did that interview? He quoted you as saying your advice to your successor would be to tell them the truth, be honest, and never seem to be a mystery.

I think that that was probably an accurate quote. Yeah, it may sound a little cute, and maybe it is a little cute, but I think it's true that a university administrator can operate not on the basis of authority—oh, he can, but he can't do it very long or very effectively—that the university administrator has to work on the basis of mutual respect and cooperation, and that's the only way I would know to do it. It's different from a business in that sense, I think. It's different from a business in a lot of ways, but it's different from a business in that sense, that if the administrator simply exercises the authority that he gets from his position and from his superiors, he can get along reasonably well for a while, and he can certainly make things look right on the surface, but you can't force anybody to be a good teacher. And you can't legislate him into being a good teacher or dictate it. Any university teacher learns after a year on the job that if he wants to, he really can do what legislators charge him with doing. That is, if you want to, you can go into class and talk off the top of your head about your summer

vacation or your garden or whatever, or tell stories, and never prepare a class and go home right afterward. It can be one of the soft jobs of all time. And you can't force anybody not to do that.

So that a university administration has to depend on the good faith and the good will and the dedication and the honesty of the staff. And if that isn't mutual, it doesn't work very well. Most of the time it does work because—oh, maybe the real—you know, sometimes nostalgically, one—I was talking the other day about some of the teachers I had had, and we talked about what good teachers were. And I was thinking that maybe the real scholars of the old school no longer exist—if they did exist, they couldn't last in the current university environment. But I don't think that's true.

We had a birthday party for Charlton Laird last week on his eightieth birthday. And Larry is a genuine scholar of the old school; he believes that—and he believed while he was teaching—that his knowledge and his scholarship and his dedication were all that he needed. And it worked, and the students respected him and still do. And his concern was not whether he was a good showman or anything else—although he was, actually!—but his concern was, was he finding out new things and was he conveying them to students? And he did that.

So that there are a lot of those traditions that exist. The ivory tower aspect of learning is probably gone and maybe a good thing. It's probably true that a teacher can't simply lock himself in a library with his books, or at least that all teachers can't, and totally ignore what goes on in the world outside, although that gets to be increasingly tempting, I suppose.

But the respect for straight scholarship rather than practical applications of the scholarship still exists and may be still

important. More and more the university is taking an active role in a community, and this is probably sound. But when it becomes primarily a power instrument or an influencing instrument in a community, it has a different function. It might be a more useful function, but it would certainly be a different one and maybe one for which the University isn't ideally constituted. (I can't remember how I got onto that.)

Oh, you asked me about the administration, yeah. And I guess I would still maintain pretty much that position. There are other things that obviously an administrator has to do, and I guess—well, the advice always to tell the truth, always to be honest. I think you have to be, in anything that's significant. There are occasions in which somebody has come into the office to ask me why he was not promoted, and I have tried to summarize the committee's findings more kindly than is really true. I think there's probably some virtue in coupling honesty with a certain amount of human sympathy, I think.

On the other hand, I think that one of the great long-run roads to disaster in personnel matters that—and I've seen it a lot with department chairmen particularly who are new to their jobs—is to tell the person who has not been promoted that, "Well, I wanted to promote you, but the committee wouldn't let me. And next year, don't worry, you'll go through." Next year—well, the trouble with that is that the person you tell it to remembers, and if it doesn't go through next year, then you're forced into a series of other kinds of excuses.

So I guess what I was thinking of there as far as personnel matters go is that it really doesn't help very much to soften everything or to pass the buck on everything, that sometimes you just have to try to be totally honest. And usually, I think it works. I think

you get more respect; certainly you get more respect that way, even though you make somebody very unhappy when he doesn't agree with you. Usually he doesn't, if it's anything negative. But I think you get more respect that way than you do by weaseling and passing the buck to somebody else. I think that you almost always get found out, if for no other reason.

There are some other things. One other thing that I think is true, particularly in a kind of democratic organization, is that a lot of the time as administrator, you have to do more homework than whatever democratic committee is involved, and have to give the committee something at least it can work on. It gets to be a little touchy, but most of the time it seems to me you're better off when you're dealing with committees, if after the committee has floundered for a week or two, the administrator does sit down and write a possible kind of set of recommendations, a report, which they can then focus on—and not necessarily agree with, and they don't always—. But I think that kind of just plain practical detail work is fairly important.

And I guess that's partly what I had in mind by saying administrators in universities shouldn't seem to be administering in the sense that they put themselves above details or minor tasks. I think the administrator has to remain a participant and maybe do more work than anybody else in the spot, in order to get the things done—by that I mean more practical detail work. I wrote a lot of committee reports that had other chairmen's names on them, and I think that's a good function for an administrator.

Is there too much administration?

Oh, sure. But I don't think you can do without it [chuckles]. The administration here and everywhere has increased tremendously,

and I seem to remember mentioning to you that the year I was at the University of Helsinki with an enrollment of about twelve thousand at the time, the administration was practically nonexistent. On the other hand, the results were less satisfactory in some ways: it was a much more elite group of students; they were on their own; all they were really doing was preparing to pass examinations, and so that the only record-keeping needed was whether they passed an examination or not. If they died from malnutrition in one of the places where they lived, nobody blamed the university; they just did. They were on their own, and the university didn't supply living or counseling or fraternities or social life or anything else. The students themselves did get together into organizations which did really quite a lot of things. I remember we went to Russia on a—as students of the University of Helsinki. And the student groups operated very well, but the administration was nil.

And while I think in a place like Nevada, every time I look at the percentage of administration as related to faculty, I think, oh yeah, there's much too much administration, and a lot of the things we're doing shouldn't be done. On the other hand, I think we have a relatively small administration—compared with other institutions, we do at Nevada—relatively small administration, given the services, the administrative services, that we plan to provide. And that's services not only to students but to faculty as well.

The faculty probably rightly feel that they should not do any kinds of administrative work, except maybe advising administrators. But they feel that they're—that that ought to be done for them, and I guess I feel the same—that the function of administration is to make it easier and better for faculty to teach. But it does get fairly elaborate and fairly extensive

when you look at all the kinds of administrative chores there are: all the financial matters; the bookkeeping, which are partly keeping up with regulations of the federal government and the state government; the business offices (I don't know how many they're employing now—not enough to get their work done, but it's a fairly big enterprise now); the president's office (I know that people there keep pretty busy, and that's a relatively small office: the president and one assistant and one associate—the assistant's full-time; the associate's half-time—and two secretaries, and that's the total of it). And that office has a lot of stuff to do. Much of it, I think, could be eliminated without drastic results in the University—except that you can't eliminate it without violating a law or violating a directive from the Board of Regents, or doing something else, at least, to a kind of practical problem.

In other words, we've got ourselves into a kind of arrangement whereby the University does—and is responsible in so many ways, that the administration becomes just more and more necessary and more and more important. And there's no doubt that it tends to keep building.

Well, to take one obvious recent example, we get an Affirmative Action—some laws and principles, and there's no way to avoid putting in an Affirmative Action officer; you have to have somebody to handle it. And you start it as a part-time duty for another administrator, but the work's just developed so much that it became a full-time job. And part of the problem is I think the—to take that particular office—I think the duties are probably tapering off now, but you still have the administrator (with tenure, I assume—I'm not sure). And so there was—I think actually that some new duties for him have been found.

And I've never, I guess, and I should have, I suppose, at some stage, tried to make a count of the administrators on the campus.

And I don't know—it's sometimes hard to classify—but it's a fair percentage; maybe five or six percent of the total staff would be involved in administration. I'm talking now about professional staff, and a lot of classified, of course.

I've just run across a statement the other day someone had made about the Board of Regents. The person characterized the Board of Regents as thinking of themselves more as the faculty's antagonist than as the University's advocate.

I think it was in the newspaper, but I can't remember in what connection. And also they were being charged with furthering either their individual self-interests or the interests of the particular part of the state they came from, rather than the University as a whole, or pushing for various disciplines or something else within the University.

Yeah, I would agree with at least some of that, to some extent from time to time. The board has had—and maybe any governmental board has this problem to some degree—but the board has had, I think, various kinds of very serious difficulties at times. One of them has been the inevitable politicizing of the board, and this takes all sorts of different forms: one of them, just trying to stay in office; another one, trying to gain a certain amount of power or prestige or recognition by going along with different groups in different ways.

And that goes back, oh, quite a long way. I think earlier I did make a statement that the state of Nevada when I came here was run by system of cronyism, and I think some of that tradition does maintain today, even. In those days, the University was one of the pieces of the pie that was cut up by the boys in power. It was partly a McCarran machine in politics, and Norman Biltz and John Mueller were sort of the political-monied leaders in the state.

Joe McDonald had the newspaper; Si Ross had the University. They were all buddies; I think all good Masons, all members—or most of 'em members of SAE fraternity at Nevada when they were undergraduates, and all that kind of thing.

Some of that still is an attitude in the board in spite of the fact that it's elected. One of the major questions about the board that comes up every few years is whether it should be shifted from an elected to an appointed board. And I'm not sure what the answer is; I think I'm inclined to believe it would be a better board if it were appointed, if there were certain kinds of restrictions and safeguards on the appointment. Say if the appointments had to be ratified in the legislature, if appointees were required to be nominated by some kind of screening committee, something like that, it might get fewer people there just because they have some special interest to push or because they find this a possible way of getting recognition for some other office.

Quite a number of members of the board have moved on into other kinds of political or semi-political positions—well, maybe not so many either. Grant Sawyer certainly was one, although I think he got his recognition less from the board than from other sources; I think he got on the board sort of incidentally. Proc Hug became a judge, but that was not an elected position. It may be it hasn't worked that well, although there is a kind of myth existing that it is a stepping stone of political power. But that's one of the things that has been true on the board.

Certainly there has been a tendency, particularly in recent years, for a north-south split on the board. And then there's also on the board been a tendency over the years to push for particular kinds of interests or programs Bucky Buchanan and his sports pavilions, for example, and that all in deference to the Las

Vegas boosters and so on, particularly Bill Morris. And the difficulty with being terribly critical of that is that it probably is all done—maybe not all, but most of it—with the best of intentions. (Some of that kind of thing I'm never quite sure about—some of Chris Karamanos's catering for the Board of Regents seemed to me to represent a kind of conflict of interest. And there were various kinds of things of that sort that went on.)

But most of the time I think these people honestly believe that the most important thing in a university is—well, the most important thing is a good football team, but next to that a good basketball team. I think that's a real matter of faith—they're trying to help the University. And, of course, they like being able to point to their alma mater as a great institution because it has a good basketball team.

So that you get that kind of individual pressure. Molly Knudtsen had a kind of alliance with the College of Agriculture, which I think she tried very hard not to let influence her, but I think it did influence her in ways that were not good for the University from time to time. Way back, Roy Hardy was interested in the Mines college and not much else.

And then the other kind of difficulty which is related to this is that inevitably the board finds itself—and this has been going on as long as I can remember—the board finds itself moving into kinds of problems and kinds of activities that are properly a matter of either local administration or a faculty decision or something like that. That is, all kinds of things from trying to get students admitted—students of friends admitted—when they aren't qualified to be admitted, to worrying about how a certain class is taught, to deciding what should be served at a dinner or banquet—but, from all sorts of trivial matters as well as relatively important ones.

In particular, and I suppose the one that is most annoying for the faculty, is trying to move in and make decisions on personnel matters, without having had the benefit of the full discussion or anything else. Usually that amounts to, oh, simply vetoing the recommendation for tenure or something, because somebody on the board has heard something bad about the person or has imagined something bad about the person, or more frequently, just disagrees with something a person has said.

And I can think of quite a number of people who've had troubles of that sort. Jim Richardson had to threaten suit in order to get his tenure passed, where there were no substantial reasons for opposing that at all, except that a couple of board members thought that he had spoken disrespectfully of the board in a couple of letters. Well, if every faculty member who spoke disrespectfully of the board were disciplined for it, we'd have no faculty left—which, I think, is a statement I remember making to the board on that occasion I [Chuckling] That is one occasion in which I wangled it to talk to an executive session of the board; I was dean of the college at the time, and did speak in Richardson's favor; I think I spoke probably too strongly. But he did get his tenure.

But there have been a lot of those—oh, not a lot, either, but several I can think of. Ken Carpenter in the library was quoted in the papers as—I can't remember what he was talking about—excessive growth in the community or something—it's silly I can't remember it now, but it was something I agreed with completely, and I suppose most of us did. But he was quoted in the newspapers, and the Board of Regents decided they ought to look into it. And, of course, it goes back to the whole Stout business, which was really the sane kind of thing: the regents wanting

to make personnel decisions, and not having the—well, not doing it on any regular basis or with any previous knowledge.

I can remember times several years ago in which the board went through the salary lists and put a hundred bucks here and knocked a hundred off there, on the basis of how they felt about the faculty members. But in general, the board, I think, does progress some, although some of the things in the last few years don't confirm that very well.

The board tends also to like to work in little cliques informally, and to get together with somebody and make deals. How seriously to take some of the stories I get about the—about the tendency of the board to use real strong-arm tactics and deals and so on to influence other members, their votes, I don't know. Some of the stories from people who are pretty close indicate that some really scandalous things go on—. You know, threatening another board member with saying that he or she will not be reelected if they don't vote this way or that on it. And quite a lot of that sure has gone on; how blatantly, I'm not sure, but some [of] it has. In fact, I heard a series of stories the other night from someone who's pretty close to the whole thing that are hair curling. I'm not sure how accurate they are! [Chuckling]

I don't know whether the board ought to be appointed or elected; I think if I had a vote, I would vote for an appointed board if machinery could be worked out for some categories for the membership. At least that would remove the necessity for campaigning and worrying about—I've forgotten what the figures in Karamanos' s campaign in Las Vegas were this year, but I think it was around a hundred thousand he spent. And whether that's just on the general or on the primary, I don't know—or both. But he spent an awful lot of money. And his opponent did, too. I

can't remember his name. Jones, was it? A dentist. I think his name was [James N.] Jones.

Well, it became hard to make a choice for people down there. Jones was, I guess, a respected member of the community, but so ultraconservative that it was kind of scary. The statement that I think turned off a lot of people or at least was the most dramatic of the many statements he made, was a statement that Tampax should be banned from the stores and from manufacture because everybody knew it was simply a device for young girls to stimulate themselves sexually. And [chuckling] this appeared in the papers, you know! And it didn't seem inconsistent with his general views! I don't think I ever met him while we were down there. He did have a fairly close race with a lot of support from the Mormon church and from the ultraconservative, anti-abortion, anti-ERA people. Strange character.

But for some reason or other, a lot of the people who seem to think they want to run for the Board of Regents are sort of offbeat in one way or another. You do get, of course, very good people running for the board sometimes—very respected people who have no ulterior motives. And I don't even object to a little bit of political ambition. You know, if Frankie Sue [Del Papa] wanted to run for something else after she's on the board, I think that's fine. But I think her motives were generally just interest in doing an important government job, and I think she'll be a good member of the board.

Fred Anderson went on the board—or Louie Lombardi for that matter, even though Louie, I think, particularly did some pretty foolish things on the board, and maybe Fred also. But I think both of them were on the board purely as matters of public service, not because they were anxious for other jobs, although Fred Anderson did run for

the Senate, oh gosh, twenty years ago, I guess. Yeah, it was about that long ago. Well, it was when Cannon—Cannon beat him in the primary of his first term.

And Fred came very close to winning the primary, and would, I think, have won the general if he had. But he was not on the board as a—although both, Fred, particularly, and Louie, too, got themselves so totally focused on the Medical School in later years that it was hard for them to make very significant judgments on other things. Well, Fred was always a pretty solid citizen on the board.

But they did really back the Medical School, especially Lombardi, didn't he?

Oh yeah, yeah. Yes, he simply concentrated on the Medical School all the time, which maybe was a good thing to do. I'm not—well, I guess I would object to it only in that whenever a matter of relative budgets came up, Fred just couldn't see that there was any risk of the Medical School getting more than its share of the pie. That is, there just was no possibility of excess with the Medical School. And again, there was a matter of conviction, I'm sure.

And he did do a great deal to help get the Medical School started and to build it. He was quite instrumental in raising money and making the community conscious of it in lobbying in Carson and so on, and serving on advisory committees. And the advisory committees in the Medical School are especially important because one of the problems with the Medical School is maintaining decent relations with the local hospitals and the local physicians.

And the local physicians are inevitably and naturally suspicious. We've had great troubles getting a good chairman of surgery, for example, largely because of the jealousies and resentments of the local surgeons. And one of

the accomplishments of the current head of surgery, Ralph DePalma, I think, is that he—well, for one thing, his national reputation is significant enough that nobody dares snipe at him on those counts; and the other one is that he's managed somehow or other to disarm the local surgeons completely, so that instead of jumping up and down and yelling, they're cooperating very nicely, apparently. And this is a great accomplishment. I don't know quite how he's done it. But he's a very mild, very successful person. I think he's done it partly because he hasn't immediately moved in and taken over a lot of their practice, which is what they're afraid of. But inevitably he's going to be having a lot of practice just because he'll get people referred to him. And he does specialized kinds of surgery that the local surgeon just can't do, I think.

But Fred did a lot in the early days, particularly, to get the medical profession united behind the Medical School, or at least as united as it ever could be on anything.

I don't think of much else that needs to be said. It seems to me we've rambled around today quite a lot. No, I don't have any very enlightening or firm closing remarks or anything of that sort. No, I don't. The University seems to me really in quite good shape now, facing what may very well be very bad times. And it's too bad (I've said this before) that just about the time the University reaches a stage in which it could be moving, in which it could be developing and improving rapidly, it's likely to get slapped back.

And for this University particularly, I think that's unfortunate just because of the stage in its development that it happens to be in. For example, for a place like Berkeley, which has already achieved a good deal of what the University of Nevada aspires to—for a place like Berkeley, the cutbacks may not be so disastrous. In fact, it might have

some advantages in tightening things. But for Nevada, the discouragement of having to cut back—plus the fact, of course, that the smaller the place, even though the percentage of cutback is the same—the smaller the place, the harder the cutbacks hurt because they are felt so much more clearly. So that it could be very hard for the University to do it, and I gather we're having trouble just meeting the budget this year, let alone next year. So, it doesn't look good. Maybe I picked a good time to retire.

So, what now?

Oh I don't know. I'm still bogged down in a lot of kind of practical domestic stuff—selling a house and moving books and building bookcases. And I've got to go back to a meeting next week and check some more on some writing that I've got in mind—.

And, well, I'm planning to keep some writing going—. We're making sort of tentative plans for some traveling maybe, if that works. Mostly I don't seem very conscientious about planning anything at all, so—[chuckles].

That's what retired is all about, isn't it?

Well, maybe, I don't know. I've got a lot of things I want to do, and I may get at 'em. I find myself getting sleepy by ten or eleven o'clock at night, however, and that cuts down on the amount of writing I get done, so—. And I seem to manage not to recover from a cold with great speed for some reason or another, but I guess nobody does from this one.

ORIGINAL INDEX: FOR REFERENCE ONLY

In order to standardize the design of all UNOHP transcripts for the online database, they have been reformatted, a process that was completed in early 2012. This document may therefore differ in appearance and pagination from earlier printed versions. Rather than compile entirely new indexes for each volume, the UNOHP has made each transcript fully searchable electronically. If a previous version of this volume existed, its original index has been appended to this document for reference only. A link to the entire catalog can be found online at <http://oralhistory.unr.edu/>.

A

- Abrams, Bill 283
Academic Council (Administrative Council), 7, 14-15, 92, 93-94, 114, 167, 183, 240, 335-336, 345-348, 355
Academic freedom, 65, 75-77, 101-103, 435, 436
 See also: Minard W. Stout
Academic standards, 152, 153, 289, 303, 426-427
 See also: Teaching quality
Academic Vice President, 39-40, 364-371
Adamian, Paul, 85-86, 156, 200-205
Adams, Gary, 34, 64
Adams, Henry, 239
Administrative Council
 See: Academic Council
Administrative reorganization, 134-135, 137-140, 147-150, 194
Advisory board, Arts and Science, 222, 255
Affirmative Action, 315-316, 365-369, 381-390, 448
Agriculture, College of (UNR), 215, 216-217, 348, 452
"Aimlessness in Education,"
 See: Arthur E. Bestor
Allerton Park Education Center (University of Illinois), 263
 See also: National Council of Teachers of English
American Association of University Professors (AAUP), 7-11, 14, 55, 77-78, 80-81, 86, 240, 378, 380
American Medical Association (AMA), 177-178, 186
Anderson, Fred M., 47, 63, 173, 178, 457-458, 459
Anderson, James T. "Jim," 214, 215, 319, 332-333, 353, 365, 370
Apportionment committee (College of Arts and Science), 355-356
Armstrong, Bryn, 96-97
Armstrong, Charles J. "Charlie," 64, 125, 130, 134-135, 139-146, 159, 197, 213
Armstrong, June, 143, 145-146
Arts and Science, College of (UNR), 216, 219-220, 332, 349, 350, 356-359, 365, 377, 383, 390
 See also: Arts and Science, Dean
Arts and Science, Dean, 219-223, 308-322, 332-334, 336, 349-352, 353-359, 361-362, 365, 383-384
 See also: College of Arts and Science
Athletics, 427-431
Atkins, Phyllis, 386
Atmospherium-Planetarium (UNR), 168
Australia, 59, 74-76

B

"Back to basics" trend,
415-417
Badt, Milton, 59, 61
Baepler, Donald H., 131,
137, 139, 221, 407
Baker, Art, 228
Bald, Robert Cecil, 417-
418
Baldwin, Bud, 175
Baxter, Frank, 306-307
Becker, Carl, 422-423
Beesley, Maurice, 6, 11,
41, 93, 127, 374
Bennett, George, 34
Bentley, Bob, 259
Bestor, Arthur E., 43-44,
56-58, 61, 79, 88-89
Billings, Dwight, 6, 11,
41
Biltz, Norman, 23, 450
Biology department (UNR),
83
Blakey, Richard W. "Dick,"
47
Bohmont, Dale W., 130,
350
Booth, Roscoe, 387
Bowers, Fredson, 263-264
Breese, Charles R. "Chuck,"
128, 350
Brink, Lauren, 108-109
Broadbent, N. E., 63
Brown, Harold N., 24, 42,
44, 61, 87-90, 114-115
Brown, Mabel, 42, 87-88
Brushfire, 35, 212-213
Buchanan, James L. II
"Bucky," 188, 216, 218-
219, 372, 373, 451
Buchanan, John, 217
Budget
See: University budget
Business Administration,
College of (UNR), 216
Butterworth, Ray, 3

C

Cain, Edmund J., 350
Caine Mutiny Court-
Martial, 123
Caldwell, Jim, 55
Caliente, Nevada, 191
Campbell, Felicia "Tippy,"
367-368, 369
Cannon, Howard, 457
Carnegie Foundation, 262
Carpenter, Kenneth J.
"Ken," 78, 339, 454
Cashell, Robert A. "Bob,"
154, 230
Catalog, UNR, 170
Chancellor, UNS, 128, 130-
131, 135-140, 147, 162-
163, 194, 406-407
Childs, Barney, 34
Chism, John, 52
Chism, Miriam, 52
Clark, Robert "Bob,"
171, 340
Clark, Walter Van Tilburg,
33, 35, 69, 83, 170-
171, 172, 339-341
College entrance exami-
nations
See: National assess-
ment tests
Communists, 47, 52-55,
76-77, 95, 243
See also: Joseph
McCarthy
Community College System,
148-153, 252-253, 294,
297-299
Conant, James Bryant,
394
Connor, Rodney V., 33
Cooney, Donald G. "Don,"
83
Cornell University, 1,
4, 183, 257, 274-275,
418-419, 422
Coulter, Steve, 154, 402,
424

Courses and curriculum
committee (UNR), 335,
347-348
Creel, Cecil, 22
Cronyism ("old-boy" syn-
drome), 23, 97, 450
Crowley, Joseph N. "Joe,"
221, 223-234, 312, 337,
359, 363, 371, 387-388
Crumley, Newton, 54
Cunningham, Mr. (philoso-
phy lecturer), 421-422

D

Daley, A. Stuart "Stu,"
30, 33, 239
Dandini, Alessandro
"Sandro," 15-17
Dankworth, Richard T.,
292
Davies, Richard O. "Dick,"
154, 225, 335
d'Azevedo, Warren L., 163
Deep Springs College
(California), 1, 275
Del Papa, Frankie Sue,
456-457
DePalma, Ralph, 458-459
Desert Research Institute
(DRI), 148, 158-169, 285
DeVane, William Clyde, 418
Dickinson, James R. "Jim,"
42-43, 114-117, 194
Donehower, Grace, 287,
300-302
Donnelly, Charles R.
"Chuck," 148-150
Doten, Alfred "Alf," 170-
171
Driggs, Don W., 83

E

Eckersall, Walter H., 430
Education, College of
(UNR), 44, 87-89, 277-
279

Edwards, Jerome "Jerry,"
381
Eldridge, Paul, 3, 33,
237
Elko Community College
(Elko, Nevada), 298-
299
Elwell, William H. "Bill,"
63
Engineers' Council for
Professional Develop-
ment (ECPD), 186
English A program
See: Remedial English
program
English department (UNR),
2-4, 6, 25-40, 50, 70-
72, 83, 108-110, 121,
124, 171, 194-195, 201-
202, 206, 211-213, 236-
271, 272-273, 274, 331,
337, 338, 351
Enrollment, student, 3,
4, 113, 284, 288-289,
330-331, 438
Equal Rights Amendment
(ERA), 157
Extension Division, 246,
287-308, 313, 348

F

Faculty (UNLV), 192-293,
363
Faculty (UNR), 4-11, 13-
18, 43-44, 62, 82-84,
98-103, 106, 111, 112-
113, 124-125, 127-128,
129, 130, 131, 134, 141-
142, 143, 182-183, 199,
215, 238-240, 276-277,
303, 333, 334, 371-372,
374-380, 390-391, 413,
424, 436-437, 447, 449,
453-454
See also: Salaries;
Tenure

Faculty dismissal, 46-50,
58, 79, 85, 95, 96, 105,
204-205, 217
Faculty governance, 6-9,
13, 17-18, 98-101, 130,
373
 See also: Administra-
 tive Council; American
 Association of Univer-
 sity Professors; Fac-
 ulty Senate, Faculty
 Welfare Committee;
 National Society of
 Professors
Faculty insubordination,
50, 89
Faculty Senate (UNLV), 192
Faculty Senate (UNR), 127,
183, 267, 372, 373-378
Faculty Welfare Committee,
15-16, 41, 44-45, 92-93,
240
Finland, 268-269
 See also: University
 of Helsinki
Fleischmann Foundation,
118, 159
Foreign language require-
ment, 158, 409, 414-415
Fortune magazine, 102
Fowler, Don D., 129, 136
Fox, Warren, 327
Francis, Elizabeth, 255
Frazier, Maude, 42, 114,
115, 196
Free speech, 77, 218
Freshman English program,
243-245, 247, 262-268,
331
Friends of the University,
51-52, 62-63, 78, 107-
108
Fulbright scholarship, 59,
74

G

Gamble, Shelba, 225-227
General University Exten-
sion (GUE)
 See: Extension Divi-
 sion
Gianneschi, Harry, 217-
218
Gibson, James I. "Jim,"
207
Gibson, Walker, 304
Glass, Mary Ellen, 228,
230
Gojack, Mary, 279-280, 341,
402, 420
Goldwater, Bert, 47, 51
Gorman, Charles "Charlie,"
7, 10, 11, 19-21
Gorrell, Johnnie Belle,
3-4, 102, 107, 219
Governor's day (1970),
85-86, 201-205
Graduate Council, 276, 278,
280, 296
Graduate Faculty (UNR),
276-277
Graduate Record Examina-
tion, 279
Graduate School (UNLV,
proposed), 283, 286
Graduate School (UNR),
256, 271-286, 287, 295-
297
Graduate School, Dean,
256, 271-272, 275-276,
281, 284-285, 296, 312-
313
Graduate teaching fellows,
206, 209-210
Gray, Leslie B., 46, 51
Griffin, Robert S., 21-22,
33
Grotegut, Eugene K. "Gene,"
34

H

Hardy, Roy, 452
 Harris, Everett W. "Ev," 108
 Harvey, Robert D. "Bob," 164, 367-368
 Harwood, Paul, 3
 Hatch Act, U.S., 13-14
 Hayakawa, S. I., 243
 Health Sciences Program, 180
 Heilman, Bob, 339
 Heward Harlan, 51, 52-54, 56-57
 Hicks, Charles Roger "Charlie," 18, 56-58, 83
 Higginbotham, Alfred L. "Al" "Higgie," 14, 61, 83, 87, 89-90
 Hilliard, Albert "Al," 19, 338
 Hilliard, Emily, 338
 Hilliard Foundation (lectureship), 338-342
 Hillmeister, Andrea, 227
 History department (UNR), 83
 Holmes, Bill, 236
 Home Economics, School of (UNR), 220
 Houghton, Edda, 52
 Houghton, Samuel, 52
 Hug, Procter, Jr. "Proc," 451
 Hughes, Howard, 179, 298
 Hughs, Richard E. "Dick," 228-229
 Hulse, James W. "Jim," 6, 11, 19, 20, 118, 140, 238, 294, 303
 Hume, Robert A. "Bob," 33, 35, 45-49, 59, 61, 66, 67-69, 78-79, 83, 94, 96-98, 100, 103-104, 238, 239

Humphrey, Neil D., 129, 130-131, 135-137, 139, 146, 148, 161-163, 166, 167, 359
 Hutchins, Maynard, 430

I

Idaho State University, 337
 Indiana University, 1-2, 4, 106, 151, 290-291, 337-439
 Introduction to Language (English course), 261
 Irwin, Ralph, 22-23, 37-40, 61, 370

J

Jacobsen, William H., 260
 Jacobson, Allvar N. "Jake," 73, 112
 Jessup, Donald K. "Don," 328
 Johns, Al, 363, 403-404
 Jones, James M., 465
 Jones, Jix, 304
 Joyce, James 212
 Judicial College (UNR)
 See: National Judicial College (UNR)

K

Karamanos, Chris, 216, 218, 452, 455-456
 Kersey, Ginny, 40
 King, Ralph, 399-400
 Kirkpatrick, Harold "Kirk," 199, 308-310, 314, 358
 Kleiner, Edgar F. "Ed," 315-316, 326-327

Knorr, Owen "Al," 148, 328
Knudtsen, Molly, 216-217,
452
Kretzmeier, Devona "Dee,"
317-319

L

Laird, Charlton "Larry,"
1-2, 25, 33, 35, 45-49,
59, 61, 66, 67-68, 78-79,
83, 94, 96-98, 102-104,
237, 238, 239, 240, 245,
256, 258-259, 261, 337,
338, 339, 340, 432, 442-
443
LaRivers, Ira, 83
Las Vegas, Nevada, 1
See also: University
of Nevada, Las Vegas
Law School (U of N, pro-
posed), 188-189
Laxalt, Paul D., 172
Laxalt, Peter "Pete," 172
Laxalt, Robert "Bob," 170,
172
League of Women Voters,
107
Legislature, Nevada state,
5, 8-11, 20, 42, 64, 112,
114, 115, 137, 153-154,
173, 174-175, 180, 187,
188, 191-192, 195-196,
207-209, 210, 222, 247,
254-255, 295, 328, 329,
331-332, 396, 397-407,
416, 431
Leifson, Sigmund W., 18
Leland, Joy, 163, 166
Lessly, Larry, 369
Library, UNR, 257, 282,
329, 439-440
Liljeblad, Astrid, 342
Liljeblad, Sven, 337-338,
341-342
Lillard, Richard "Dick,"
1-2, 65, 91-92

Linskie, Rosella, 199
List, Robert, 329
Little, Thomas "Tom," 48,
49, 53-55, 58-59, 83,
103-104
Lobbying, 405-406, 458
See also: Nevada
state Legislature
Loevgren, Sven, 339
Lombardi, Louis E.
"Louie," 173, 457
Love, Malcolm A., 18-19,
41, 98-99, 141
Lowrance, E. W. "Ed," 5,
6, 431
Lutz, Bill, 259

Mc

McBride, John, 230
McCarran, Patrick A. "Pat,"
23, 450
McCarthy, Joseph, 47, 74,
75-76, 435
McCorkle, Cliff, 403
McDonald, Joseph F., 97
McHenry, Dean E., 65, 90-
92, 125
McHenry Committee Report,
64-66, 90-92

M

Maher, Fred, 208-210
Mascott, Lawrence E.
"Laurie," 30-31, 32
Mascott, Tina, 30-32
Masons, 21-24
Master's degree program
(UNR), 189, 278, 279-
282
Mazour, Anatole, 76-77
Mazzaferri, Ernest L.
"Ernie," 178, 183-184
Means, Tosca Masini, 71

Medical School (UNR), 132,
 172-188, 190-192, 331-
 332, 457-459
 Melton, Rollan "Rollie,"
 436
 Melz, Christian W. F.
 "Fritz," 6, 11, 61, 90
 Merit review committee
 (UNR), 347
 Metcalfe, Joan, 227, 318,
 320
 Milam, Max, 146, 148, 149,
 204, 215-221, 224, 225-
 227, 365-369, 370-372,
 383, 384
 Miller, Milton, 382
 Miller, N. Edd, 131-134,
 140, 142, 144, 156, 174,
 197-206, 215, 226, 309,
 310, 311, 322-333, 372
 Miller, Nena, 133, 200
 Miller, William C. "Bill,"
 21, 22, 33
 Minedew, Sunny, 320-321
 Mines, School of (UNR),
 216, 348-349, 452
The Miracle of Language,
 261
 Mobley, Elaine, 61, 82-83
 Moose, Joe E., 275
 Moral turpitude, 129
 Mordy, Brooke, 165
 Mordy, Wendell A., 130,
 159-169, 347
 Morehouse, Harold "Hap,"
 329
 Morris, William W. "Bill,"
 129, 199, 372-373, 451
 Morrison, John, 30, 33, 71-
 72, 83, 120-123, 238, 239
 Moseley, John, 10, 11-12,
 19-21, 25-27, 70-71, 99,
 141, 211-212
 Moyer, Donald C. "Don,"
 140, 146-147
 Mueller, John V., 23, 450

Music department (UNR),
 386, 387
 "My Red, White and Blue
 Baby" (song), 74

N

National assessment tests,
 248-249, 250, 253
 National Council of
 Teachers of English,
 262-264
 National Education Asso-
 ciation (NEA), 379-380
 National Judicial College
 (UNR), 188-190
 National Science Founda-
 tion (NSF), 272
 National Society of Pro-
 fessors (NSP), 378,
 380-381
 N. Edd Miller Day (1970),
 133, 134, 200
 Nellor, John, 284, 285
 Nevada Southern campus
 See: University of
 Nevada, Las Vegas
 Nevada Technical Insti-
 tute, 299-300
 Nevin, Alice, 320
 Newman, John Henry, 413
New York Times, 53-54
 Nursing, School of (UNR),
 187, 220

O

O'Brien, Leo "Pat," 70-71
 O'Brien, Thomas D. "Tom,"
 145, 204, 271, 276, 277,
 278, 281, 284-286
 Olsen, Edward A. "Ed,"
 45, 96-97
 "107 committee" (Faculty
 Senate), 375-376
 O'Neil, Professor, 306

P

Pacific University (Forest Grove, Oregon), 125-126
 Page, Paul, 311-312, 313
 Parker, Gilbert E., 12-13, 14, 15, 16-17, 141
 Personnel committee (UNR), 335, 347
 Pfaff, Donald "Don," 305
 Pflug, Ray, 32
 Ph.D. program (UNR), 256-261, 272-274, 282-283
 Phoenix, Dave, 206-208, 210
 Pine, Edward L. "Ed," 22
 Porta, Mena, 319-320
 Press, University of Nevada, 170-172
 Price, Becky, 211-212
 Promotion committee (UNR), 347
 Promotion, faculty, 343, 346-347, 432, 444
 Puffer, Merle G., 386, 387

R

Raggio, William J. "Bill," 210
 Reagan, Ronald, 396-397
 Reed, Jackie, 318, 320, 327
 Regents, Board of, 4, 7, 13, 19-20, 23, 46-54, 56-64, 78, 82, 111, 124-125, 129, 131, 133-134, 146, 147, 148, 149-150, 153, 154-155, 162, 165-167, 173, 188, 198-199, 200, 202-204, 215-218, 220, 224, 230, 231, 309, 332-333, 338, 368, 372-373, 397-398, 399-400, 449-458
 "Relevance" trend (1960s), 156-157, 415
 Remedial English program, 245-247, 251-255

Reno Evening Gazette, 331
 Research, 5, 98, 112, 154, 159-160, 165, 168-169, 238-239, 257, 284-285, 361-362, 391, 402, 425, 431-435, 437-438
 Rice, Gordon, 47
 Richardson, Frank, 6, 41, 43-45, 48, 49-52, 55-62, 67, 79, 82-86, 88-90, 93-94, 104-105
 Richardson, James T. "Jim," 229, 303, 453-454
 Rodee, Carlton, 92
 Roll, John, 441
 Ross, John Tom, 216
 Ross, Silas E. "Si," 4-5, 13, 19-20, 21, 22-23, 70-73, 86, 94, 97-99, 101-102, 103, 105, 120-123, 372, 450
 ROTC, 201, 203
 See also: Governor's Day (1970)
 Ruebsam, Edith, 7
 Russell, Charles H. "Charlie," 63
 Russell, Ruth I., 82
 Ryser, Fred, Jr., 83

S

Sabbatical leave, 7-8
 Salaries, faculty, 8-11, 58-59, 61-62, 90, 112, 161, 191, 217-218, 288-289, 291, 294, 379-380, 385-386, 454
 Salary committee (AAUP), 8, 9-11
 Sale, Bill, 263
 Saline Valley (California), 45, 68-69
San Francisco Chronicle, 248-249
Saturday Evening Post, 32
 Sawyer, Grant, 63, 451
 S-Bar-S ranch (Wadsworth, Nevada), 223

Scholastic Aptitude Test
(SAT), 249, 250
Scott, William "Bill," 339
Scully, Thomas J. "Tom,"
178
Sears, George, 18
Shepperson, Wilbur S., 83
Sigma Alpha Epsilon (SAE)
fraternity, 21-24
Slattery, James "Slats,"
208
Smith, Catherine, 384-388
Smith, George T., 173, 175-
177, 178, 179-180, 182,
183
Speech department (UNR),
33, 36-37
Springer, Charles E.
"Charlie," 205
Squires, Patrick "Pat,"
163
Stafford, Rebecca S.
"Becky," 220-223, 255,
319, 320, 327, 334, 335,
361-362, 383-384
Stanford University, 190
Stegner, Wally, 339
Steninger, Melvin "Mel,"
129, 199, 372
Stockman, David, 396
Stoess, Al, 367, 368
Stout, Minard W., 6, 19,
24, 33, 41-123, 124,
126-127, 141, 158-159,
239, 338, 346, 373, 378,
431-432, 436-437, 454
Student-faculty ratio,
177, 186-187, 332
Summerfield, Lester D.,
51, 52-54, 56-57
Summer session (UNR),
288
Supreme Court, Nevada
state, 46-47, 59, 61,
104, 107
Swope, Jack, 208

T

Teacher-course evaluation,
410-412, 423-424
Teaching load, 5, 36, 293-
294, 336-337, 359-364,
401, 403-404
Teaching quality, 417-424,
433-434, 441-443
Tenure committee (UNR),
347
Tenure, faculty, 61, 106-
107, 183-184, 202, 205,
312, 346-347, 384, 386-
388, 432, 453-454
Thompson, Bruce R., 45-47,
51, 62, 63
Thompson, Ellen, 339
Thompson, Helen, 368-369,
370
Time magazine, 69
Titlow, Emerson, 207-208
Tonopah, Nevada, 288
Traner, Fred W., 14-15,
18, 24
Tucker, Thomas, 278

U

Ulysses, 211-212
"Unionization" of faculty,
379-380, 437
UNITE, 303-307
University budget, 155,
327-332, 342-343, 350-
356, 398-399, 404-405,
406-407, 460
University of California,
Berkeley, 281
University of Chicago, 430
University Club, 436
University Code (U of N),
127-130, 136
University of Helsinki
(Finland), 268-269, 323-
326, 446

University of Miami (Coral
Gables, Florida), 118
University of Nevada, Las
Vegas (UNLV), 42-43,
113-117, 128-129, 147,
169, 188-189, 192-196,
283, 286, 288, 358, 363,
403-404, 429, 437
University of Nevada System
(UNS), 128, 139-140, 159,
162, 169, 287-288
See also: Chancellor,
UNS; Community College
System; Desert Research
Institute; Extension
Division; University
Code; University of
Nevada, Las Vegas
University of Southern
California (USC), 260
University of Sydney
(Australia), 74
See also: Australia
Ussery, Huling, 34

V

Valley-Times (Las Vegas,
Nevada), 363, 403
Vietnam War, 129, 201, 203-
204

W

Wagner, Sue, 406
Walker, Gloria Mapes, 70-
71
Warburton, Joseph A. "Joe,"
163
Water Resources building
(UNR campus), 168
Watts, Ernst J., 189
Went, Frits W., 163
Westall, Peggy, 153-154
Wheeler, Sessions, 339
Whitehall, Harold O.
"Fritzie," 1-2

Williamson, Professor, 263
Wilner, Herb, 339
Wilson, Thomas "Spike,"
222, 255, 403
Winterowd, Ross, 260
Wittenberg, Helen, 51-52,
78-79, 102, 107-108
Wittenberg, Ralph, 51, 78
Wolf, Harry, 300, 366, 367
Wood, Frederick "Fred,"
10, 21, 24, 66-68, 88,
93, 100-101, 106-107,
114-117, 382
Wood, William Ransome
"Bill," 109-112, 124-
125, 127-128, 140, 141,
158-159
Woods, H. Jennings, 260
World War II, 438
Writing skills, 247-251,
255

XYZ

Xerox company, 304-305